CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

0-315-19574-6

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

232

67482

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

WALTER EDWARD PAWLOVICH

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

APRIL 9 1940

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

2506 ARLINGTON AVE. SASKATOON, SASK
S7J 2J1

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE AND EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING.

University — Université

UNIV OF ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

PH.D.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

HARVEY ZINGLE

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

July 12/83

Signature

Walter E. Pawlovich

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE AND EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING

by

(C) WALTER EDWARD PAWLOVICH

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: WALTER E. PAWLOVICH

TITLE OF THESIS: QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE AND EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: PH.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1983

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholary or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Walter E. Pawlovich

Walter E. Pawlovich
2506 Arlington Avenue
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Dated June 16, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Quality of School Life and Early School Leaving", submitted by Walter Edward Pawlovich in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology.

Supervisor

External Examiner

Date: 16 June 1983

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my two children, Jill and Andrew Pawlovich.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the differences in the perceptions of Quality of School Life (QSL) among students from schools classified as high, medium and low early school leaving schools. Eighty-nine early school leavers and eighty-one stay-ins comprised the sample for the empirical portion of this study. The Williams and Batten (1981) adapted version of Quality of School Life Questionnaire, relabelled the Student Survey (Form A) was administered to the subjects. A multivariate (MANOVA) and univariate (ANOVA) analysis of variance involving a fixed two factor crossed design did not produce any significant differences in any of the status or level factors.

As supplementary data, 70 early school leavers, their parents, teachers and age-mate stay-ins were interviewed. The interview data seemed to corroborate the QSL findings. No differences among the three groups on attitudinal, self esteem, interest, and commitment variables were discernible. It is likely that the homogeneity of the samples may be the reasons why no differences on the QSL or the interview data were obtained. All four of the interview groups cited school related factors as the major reason for leaving school early. A mismatch between the school environment and course offerings and the students' educational and personal inclinations appeared to account for the students' early departure from secondary school. A plea for improved teacher-pupil relationships, more pupil services and alternatives to academics was evident from all four groups. Teachers and principals revealed a desire for more parental community-governmental support in order to enhance the quality of education in their schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere gratitude to Dr. Harvey Zingle, committee chairman, for his competent guidance and encouragement throughout the formulation and completion of this study.

Appreciation is expresed to Dr. William Hague, Dr. Don Sawatzky, Dr. Ronna Jevne, and Dr. Ken Jacknicke for serving as committee members.

The writer is particularly indebted to Dr. Bikkar (Randy) Randhawa and to Sonia Cipywnyk for their assistance and moral support.

Thanks are also due to Dr. Lloyd Njaa for his support and encouragement and to Pauline Maione for typing the thesis, and to Denise Buteau, Verna Scharf, Paul Cipywnyk and Lesia Fedeyko who assisted with the data collection and processing.

Finally, the writer would like to express his sincere gratitude to his children, Jill and Andrew for their encouragement and love. I shall always cherish the support and time they allowed me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	1
A. INTRODUCTION	1
B. THEORETICAL RATIONALE	6
C. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	8
D. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
A. RESEARCH RELATIVE TO QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE	12
1. The Quality of School Life	13
2. School Climate	13
3. Student Attitudes	15
4. Quality of School Life	16
5. Definition and Conceptualization of Quality of School Life	18
6. Summary	25
B. RESEARCH RELEVANT TO EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING	25
1. Family Background Factors	27
Sex of leavers	27
Socioeconomic level	28
Economic need	33
Educational level of parents	34
Family size and status	36
Family relationships	39
Ordinal position and educational level of siblings	42
Place of birth and ethnicity	43
Religious background and participation	44

2. Intellectual Ability and School-Related Factors . . 44
Reading acheivement 47
Grade failure 47
Classroom grades 49
Participation in school activities 50
Dissatisfaction with school 50
Rebellious behavior in school 51
Program of study 51
Delinquent behavior 52
3. Psychological Factors 52
Alienation 52
Teacher behavior 56
Drug use 57
Contextual effects 59
Personality characteristics 60
4. Cause or Symptom 62
5. Summary 64
III. RESEARCH DESIGN 65
A. SELECTION OF SCHOOLS AND IDENTIFICATION OF EARLY SCHOOL LEAVERS 65
B. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE SURVEY FORMS 67
C. QUALITY OF SURVEY FORMS 70
1. Reliability Analysis 71
2. Cluster Analysis 74
3. Factor Analysis 80
Form A 81
Form B 85

D. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE PROCEDURES 87
E. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE ANALYSIS 89
F. INTERVIEWING METHODOLOGY 90
G. INTERVIEW SCHEDULES 91
H. INTERVIEWING PROCEDURES 92
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 94
A. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE 94
B. REASONS AND CAUSES FOR LEAVING SCHOOL EARLY RESULTS . . 97
C. INTERVIEW RESULTS 103
D. DISCUSSION OF QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE RESULTS 153
E. REASONS FOR LEAVING 159
F. DISCUSSION OF INTERVIEW RESULTS 160
V. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 172
A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 177
B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICAL APPLICATION 178
SELECTED REFERENCES 183
APPENDIX A 193
APPENDIX B 198
APPENDIX C 206
APPENDIX D 210
APPENDIX E 220
APPENDIX F 223
APPENDIX G 226
APPENDIX H 229

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Sample Composition by School Level Classification of Rate of Early Leaving and by Subject Status Category for Two Years	68
2	Conventional Reliability Results of Student Survey Form A	72
3	Conventional Reliability Results of Student Survey Form B	75
4	Correlation Matrices of the Clusters for the Quality of School Life Items for Forms A and B	79
5	Varimax Factor Loadings for Form A of the Quality of School Life	82
6	Varimax Factor Loadings and Communalities of the 21 Items of the Quality of School Life Form A	84
7	Varimax Factor Loadings for Form B the Quality of School Life	86
8	Varimax Factor Loadings and Communalities or the 21 Items of School Life Form B	88
9	Means of Five Scales for the 25 Items of the Quality of School Life Form A for Three Status Categories and Three Level Classifications	96
10	Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items on Personal Causes for Leaving School Early	98
11	Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items on School-Related Causes for Leaving School Early	99
12	Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses of Items on Economic Causes for Leaving School Early	100
13	Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items Pertaining to the Extent of Support Provided by Others	102
14	Mean and Standard Deviation of Items Pertaining to the Nature of the Decision to Leave School	102
15	Age Distribution, Sex, and Grade of Early School Leavers for Two Years from Six Schools	104
16	Frequency of Classes Skipped by Early School Leavers	110

17	Reasons for Skipping Class as Reported by Early School Leavers	111
18	Positive Aspects Regarding School as Reported by Early School Leavers	112
19	Negative Aspects Regarding School as Reported by Early School Leavers	113
20	Time When Feelings Changed from Positive to Negative Toward School by Early School Leavers	114
21	Quickness of Early School Leaver's Decision to Leave School	116
22	Early School Leavers' Reasons for Leaving School	117
23	Precipitating Factors Affecting Early School Leaving	120
24	Early School Leavers' Future Plans in Lieu of School	124
25	Early School Leavers' Suggestions for Prevention of Early School Leaving	125
26	Early School Leavers' Employment Activities Since Leaving School	127
27	Early School Leavers' Future Plans Regarding Going Back to School	129
28	Early School Leavers' Future Plans Regarding a Career	130
29	Early School Leavers' Regrets Regarding Leaving School	131
30	Early School Leavers' Suggested Changes in School Functioning	133
31	Early School Leavers' Comments Regarding Work Experience	134
32	Comparison of Early School Leavers' Responses to that of His/Her Parent(s) and Teacher(s)/Principal	136
33	Comparison of Early School Leavers' Reasons for Leaving School as Reported by Leavers Themselves, Their Parent(s) and Teacher(s)/Principal	140
34	Parents' Views Regarding School Program	143
35	Teachers'/Principals' Perceptions Regarding Early School Leaving	144
36	Principals'/Teachers' Perception Regarding What Should Be Done About the Early School Leaver Situation	147

37	Stay-ins' Reasons for Planning to Leave School	149
38	Stay-ins' Perceptions of Precipitating Factors Related to Thinking of Early School Leaving	150
39	Stay-ins' Reasons for Staying	151
40	Stay-ins' Perceptions Regarding Why Students Leave Early	154
41	Stay-ins' Suggestions for Handling Early School Leaving Situtation	155

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of students leaving school early is not new. Concerns about the early school leaver began to appear in the literature in the early 1950's. The major causes and reasons given for students leaving high school in the 1950's were primarily related to socio-economic structures of our society. Since the socio-economic structures of our society in the 1980's are different from that of the 1950's, it is important to ascertain whether or not the causes and reasons given by students leaving high school prior to graduation have changed. In addition to socio-economic changes there have been many changes pertaining to the general school organization as well as the functioning of individual classrooms. Among recent educational changes, the major changes have been in curricular philosophy and content, administrative principles and procedures, classroom management techniques and methods of meeting individual differences in learning styles and cognitive abilities. How are these changes perceived by students? What are the effects of these changes on the quality of school life? To answer these and related questions it seems important to investigate students' perceptions regarding the reasons and causes for early school leaving. These findings may assist school personnel and those who provide for the public education, taxpayers, with a better appreciation of the early leaving phenomenon. Also, some ways and means can be sought to address this issue properly.

A recurring theme in the literature about school environments is that schools differ along some global dimension variously defined as

"climate", "feel", or "tone". A recent outgrowth of the contextual effects studies has been the development of the "quality of school life" concept. Further research is required to resolve the importance of this concept and to determine which aspects of the school environment are particularly problematic for students.

Whether one assigns the responsibility to the individual who leaves school before grade 12 completion or to the school environment the student leaves, the fact remains that the phenomenon of early school leaving is symptomatic of something gone wrong. This study was designed to determine the status of the "quality of school life" as a function of the early school leaving situation.

Previous research on early school leavers paints a rather gloomy picture. The early school leaver is seen as a student who has experienced difficulties in learning from primary school on to high school, and often has had repeated failures (Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971). The early school leaver has rarely been involved in extra-curricular school activities (Cervantes, 1965) and has often been a discipline problem (Nachman, Getson, & Odger, 1965). The typical early school leaver comes from a large family, sometimes a broken one, and from a low socio-economic background (Bachman et al., 1971), which does not foster high aspirations (Bledsoe, 1959). The early school leaver has low self-esteem (Whitmore & Chapman, 1969) and feels isolated and alienated (Schreiber, 1966).

A few studies of early school leavers have uncovered some positive features associated with early school leaving. One longitudinal study found that many early school leavers earn more money and show more leadership ability than do graduates (Combs & Cooley, 1968). Another

survey found that early school leavers had positive feelings about further education and were intending to continue (Wright, Hindele, & Goldstein, 1973). However, the overall picture of early school leavers is that of aimless and alienated individuals.

In previous studies it has become clear that no single reason can account for early school leaving but that the phenomenon is due to an intricate combination of social, educational and economic variables (Greene, 1966; Peebles, 1973; Kumar, Padro, & Watson, 1977).

Some social factors which may predispose the student to early school leaving may include individual traits such as the student may be older than his classmates (Greene, 1966), and he may be markedly different from his peers in interests, socio-economic status, physique, national origin and/or personality characteristics (Zeller, 1966). Also, family-related variables such as the level of education and the type of employment of his parents, the size of the family and attitudes of parents toward education may contribute significantly to a decision of the potential early school leaver to leave (Greene, 1966; Zeller, 1966; Peebles, 1973).

The importance of educational or school related factors must also be seriously considered. Zeller (1966) and Greene (1966) have indicated that they believe a failure to achieve academically, a low reading ability, failing grades and irregular attendance are among the primary predictors of early school leaving. Coupled with and possibly as a result of these influences, Cervantes (1965) and Greene (1966) suggest that attitudes reflecting a general lack of interest in or dissatisfaction with school, and/or antagonism toward teachers and administration may also be key factors.

In addition, economic conditions such as low income, and individual or family financial problems may either necessitate or provide a convenient excuse for students to leave school to seek other types of activities (Zeller, 1966; Kumar, Padro, & Watson, 1977). These factors should not be regarded as separate entities; rather the motivation behind a student leaving can be more accurately viewed as an interaction among various variables (Archer 1978).

While few educators would disagree that a satisfying school experience is more desirable than an unhappy one, student satisfaction has generally been treated as a variable important mainly for its academic consequences. Positive attitudes toward school have been considered important only for their association with academic success (Jackson, 1968). Recently several researchers have discussed student reactions to school as a separate outcome of schooling (Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, & Michelson, 1972; Mayeske, Wisler, Beaton, Weinfield, Cohen, Okada, Proshek, & Tabler, 1972; Silberman, 1970). Several innovations in school organization have resulted in educators becoming aware of student reactions to school; one of the most often cited observations in the descriptive literature on open classrooms is that the students "appeared" happier, more involved in their work, and more positive toward their teachers (Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967; Weber, 1971). An increased interest in student satisfaction, as an outcome, as a function of environmental modifications has resulted in several researchers attempting to conceptualize, define and measure the "quality of school life."

Williams and Batten (1981) noted that observers of schools have often commented that schools vary a great deal in the quality of

environment they offer their students. For example, Jencks, et al., (1972) observed and concluded that "some schools are dull, depressing, even terrifying places, while others are lively, comfortable, and reasssuring" (p. 256). Following up on this notion, Epstein and McPartland (1976) and Williams and Batten (1981) identified this concern with the "quality of school life."

The Williams and Batten (1981) model of quality of school life is characterized by a number of feelings and experiences of students. Students at school experience a feeling of general well-being, captured by notions of "enjoyment", "feeling great", "being happy", finding "learning is a lot of fun", and "liking to be there". They also experience feelings of negative affect at school; the experiences of depression, loneliness, of being upset, and of being restless. In addition to general and negative affect, Williams and Batten (1981) maintain that students also experience feelings of well-being in regard to four general domains of the school experience. Firstly, feelings of status which are apparent in students' school experiences and are derived mainly from others to the extent that others "look up to", "think a lot of", "have confidence in", and "seek the help of", so that he/she feels important and experiences feelings of well-being in their domain. Secondly, schools also provide for feelings of identity when they make provision in their socialization structures for students to learn "to get along with other people", "accept people as they are", and "know, learn and understand themselves". Thirdly, teacher-student interaction occupies the major portion of a student's school day. The quality of this interaction ought to be a matter of concern to students and an influence on their well-being. The meaning given to this domain

centers on the equity of this interaction in the sense that teachers are fair and just in their feelings toward students. The remaining domain is represented within the opportunity dimension. This domain refers to students' feelings of competence and the opportunities that follow. These are captured in notions of doing well enough to be successful, reaching "a satisfactory standard", knowing the "sorts of things I can do well", and knowing "how to cope with work".

Williams and Batten (1981) have developed a questionnaire which they claim measures six dimensions of the quality of school life, dimensions grounded in an explicit theory and supported by data that suggest each has empirical as well as theoretical validity.

B. THEORETICAL RATIONALE

Studies regarding contextual effects upon the educational experiences of students have been confusing and contradictory in their findings. Several educators (Boyle, 1966; Coleman et al., 1966; McDill & Coleman, 1965; Michael, 1961; O'Neill, 1978) have maintained that a positive school environment is conducive to student attainment of their educational goals. On the other hand, Hauser (1969), McDill, Meyers, and Rigsby (1967), Myer (1970), and Nelson (1972) claim that the magnitude of school environmental effects are negligible. A recent outcome of the contextual effects studies has been the development of the "quality of school life" concept. Further research is required to resolve the importance of this concept and to determine which aspects of the school environment are particularly problematic for students. The literature does not appear to indicate that there has been any attempt to correlate quality of school life dimensions with the incidence of early school leaving. A purpose of this study was to

investigate the rates of early school leaving as a funtion of the student's perceptions of quality of school life.

When one examines the early school leaving rates, it becomes obvious that schools differ in their student retention ratios. There appears to be a paucity of research as why rates differ from school to school. It has already been pointed out that individuals attending schools differ in family background, academic ability and personal characteristics which may account for differential early school leaving rates. Another plausible explanation worthy of consideration is that rates may be related to students' perceptions of their quality of school life. If schools differ in the quality of school life as perceived by students, then it should logically follow that schools with low dropout rates should have students that perceive their quality of school life to be better than schools with medium or high early school leaving ratios.

One might speculate whether students' perceptions of their quality of school life change over a period of time. Several researchers (Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Reich & Young, 1975) reported that students often regret having left school early and that their perceptions of the educative process change after they have had experienced out of school activities on a full time basis. Perhaps duration of time out of school may be related to changes in perceptions early school leavers have of their quality of school life. If this is true, then students who have been out of school for a considerable period of time would tend to perceive retrospectively the quality of school life more favorably than those who have been out of school for a short time.

Another relevant research question is, do early school leavers differ in their perceptions of quality of school life as compared to their characteristically similar age-mates? It has been noted by several researchers that some students leave school while some characteristically similar age-mates remain. Is it possible that the stay-ins perceive their quality of school life more positively than the students who leave early?

C. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine the reasons students leave school prior to grade 12 completion and the circumstances surrounding that decision. The primary focus of this investigation was on the quality of life in schools as this was perceived by students. The main objective of this study was to determine whether the student's perceptions of their quality of school life is related to their decisions to terminate their high school education prior to grade 12 completion. It is proposed to sharpen the early school leaving issue itself and to better understand its various aspects and interrelationships. Five dimensions of quality of school life were measured and correlated to the incidence of students leaving school prior to grade 12 completion.

This study was primarily an empirical study which tested the following null hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences in the perception of quality of school life for students from schools classified as high, medium and low early school leaver schools.

Null Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences in perception of the quality of school life among students that have left

school prior to grade 12 completion and their age-mate stay-ins within the same school.

Null Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences in perceived quality of school life between students who had left school prior to grade 12 completion for a duration of less than six months as compared to students who had left school prematurely for a duration of more than eight months.

In addition to the empirical aspect of the study, supplementary information regarding early school leavers was obtained by interviewing a sample of early school leavers, their parents, teachers, principals and students who are characteristically similar to school leavers but are presently attending school. This portion of the study dealt with perceptions, attitudes and opinions regarding early school leaving as perceived and stated by the various groups. Specifically, the following questions were addressed:

1. What are the reasons and conditions surrounding the decision to leave school prematurely?

2. What are the early school leavers' attitudes towards school?

3. What are the early school leavers' stated perceptions of parental attitudes toward and involvement in the decision to leave school?

4. What was the nature and level of peer influence on the "early school leavers"?

5. What are the "early school leavers" perceived future goals and aspirations regarding themselves?

6. What are the perceptions of principals, teachers, parents and students regarding the early school leaving issue?

7. What was the nature and extent of differences between students who are similar characteristically to early school leavers but who remain in school?

D. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Early school leaver. For the purpose to this study, an early school leaver:

> . . . is a pupil who leaves school, for any reason except death, before graduation or completion of a program of study without transferring to another school. The term early school leaver is used to designate those secondary school pupils who withdrew from Public Secondary school membership within the last two years and who were deficient at least one year or eight classes of grade twelve completion. Such an individual will be considered an early school leaver whether his leaving occurs during or between regular school terms, whether his leaving occurs before or after he has passed the compulsory school attendance age, and, where applicable, whether or not he has completed a minimum required amount of school work (Reich & Young, 1975).

This study did not regard early school leavers as having fully terminated their educative processes. Instead, it viewed early school leavers as individuals who have presently ceased attending any public secondary school. They may not be "dropping out" as such, but may be transferring to another activity other than public secondary education. This study has purposely avoided the use of the term "dropout" because of its possible ambiguity and negative connotation. However, the term dropout is used in the literature review due to the fact that many researchers have referred to the early school leaver as a "dropout."

"Quality of school life" has been conceptually defined in the theoretical discussion of this study. An operational definition of the quality of school life was considered as the measure obtained by the 25 odd numbered items on the Student Survey Form (Form A) (Appendix A) and

the Students in School Survey Form (Form A) (Appendix C).

Schools were classified according to their 1980/81 early school leaving rates, the classification levels were termed as being high, medium or low level schools.

High level schools were those schools which were reported by the Department of Education to have had early school leaving rates between 46% to 20% for the 1980/81 school year.

Medium level schools were those schools which were reported by the Department of Education to have had early school leaving rates between 19% to 10% from the 1980-81 school year.

Low level schools were those schools which were reported by the Department of Education to have had early school leaving rates between 9% and 0% for the 1980/81 school year.

Stay-ins were those students which were experiencing some academic difficulties in school and displaying similar behaviors and attitudes towards school as their early school leaving classmates did prior to their leaving. The similar behaviors and attitudes included skipping classes, disinterest in school and devoting a minimum effort towards achieving academic success.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Two separate, but related, topics are addressed in this review of literature. The first part deals with the conceptualization, definition and measurement of an aspect of schooling that is referred to as "quality of school life." The second part of the review focuses upon the research studies that pertain to the issue of early school leaving.

A. RESEARCH RELATIVE TO QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE

Much of what is known about the "quality of school life" appears to have evolved as a result of studies of student learning, mainly as an interest in non-cognitive influences on achievement (Williams & Batten, 1981). Motivation and ability have always been considered as part of the achievement determiners and student attitudes to school, teachers or courses have been built into these models in attempts to isolate the motivational components of achievement (Williams & Batten, 1981). The essence of this argument is that students who are happier, more enthusiastic, more engaged in life within schools are likely to learn more and perform better on achievement tests. The "Like School" scale developed for use in the cross-national studies on educational achievement, the International Educational Achievement (IEA) studies appear to reflect this argument (Husen, 1967). However, Epstein and McPartland (1976) point out that there has been little systematic study of the aspects of school life that evoke those feelings, probably because the quality of students' school lives is seen more as a means to an end rather than an end in itself.

Studies of job satisfaction are common in the educational

administration literature where the primary concern has been with the quality of teachers' school lives (Holdaway, 1978). This same literature also reflects a concern with the organizational climate of schools as reflected mainly in teacher attitudes, and the relationship of this climate to organizational effectiveness/efficiency. The research on organizational climate of schools is ultimately rationalized in terms of its effects on student achievement. The principal justification is that teachers who are happier and in agreement with their principal will function more effectively in their teaching role and the school as an organization will run smoothly (Williams & Batten, 1981).

1. The Quality of Students' School Lives

The quality of students' lives in school have been studied primarily from one of two perspectives. One of these approaches pertains to school climate studies which involves the collection of perceptions regarding individual values, beliefs, and school behaviors. These dimensions characterize collective views regarding the environment under examination, which typically have been school or classroom environments. The second approach refers to attitude studies which tend to focus on individual variation in feelings about school. Both perspectives work from individual level data in the first instance which is later translated into a collective or a global measure.

2. School Climate

Since the late 1950's a variety of educational researchers with a variety of theoretical perspectives have attempted to conceptualize, define and measure some global dimension variously identified as "climate", "tone", "feel". One of the earliest was the Pace and Stern

(1958) work on psychological characteristics of college environment based on Murray's (1938) needs-press theory of personality development. In 1963 Halpin and Croft published their work on the organizational climate of schools in the form of the well-known OCDQ, with its eight dimensions of school climate, as seen by teachers: disengagement, hindrance, esprite, intimacy aloofness, thrust, production, emphasis and consideration. Stern extended his earlier work on college environment to develop the High School Characteristics Index (HSCI) as a means of "objectively" assessing the climate of individual schools through student perceptions, using 30 scales such as Abasement-Assurance, Deference-Restiveness, Narcissism, and Sensuality-Puritanism (Stern, 1970). Moos and associates generalized their interest in the characterization of work environment to include a Classroom Environment scale (Moos & Trickett, 1974) which comprises nine subscales: involvement, affiliation, teacher support, task orientation, competition, order and organization, rule clarity, teacher control, and innovation. Moos (1978) later developed a five-fold typology of classrooms using these measures and related them to measures of student satisfaction with life in the classrooms, teachers, courses and other students.

Several researchers have studied sociopsychological climates and their effects in classrooms (Anderson, 1968; Insel & Moos, 1974; Moos, 1973; Moos & Insel, 1974; Schultz, 1974, 1975, 1979; Walberg, 1968a, 1968b; Walberg & Ahlgren, 1970; Walberg & Anderson, 1968). They have found that there are many correspondences between specific climate dimensions and cognitive and affective behaviors in the classroom. Although the results are somewhat ambiguous with respect to cognitive

behavior, in terms of affective behavior, some conclusions have been reached which suggest that different learning environments are desirable according to the different needs of students (Buchanan, 1981).

The study of sociopsychological climates began with the development of the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI; Anderson, 1973) and then later the Classroom Environment Scale (CES; Moos & Trickett, 1974). The above two instruments were later developed into The Adult Classroom Climate Scale (ADUCCS) (Buchanan, 1981), which is comprised of eight dimensions of classroom climate: traditional teaching, open teaching, planning-teaching, personal development, affect, relationship, cognitive emphasis, and structural factors. The ADUCCS requires students and teachers to respond in terms of their ideal and actual classroom. The results yield the kinds of actual, and ideal sociopsychological climates respondents desire.

Buchanan (1981) used the ADUCCS to examine affect and sociological climates in adult education classes. Buchanan's (1981) findings indicated that students perceived their classrooms as having moderate amounts of all eight of the sociopsychological climate dimensions. In their ratings students indicated they wanted more of seven of the eight dimensions. Personal Development, Affect, and Relationship were the three dimensions rated the highest by students. These same dimensions showed the most significant and positive correlations with the different measures of student affect (Buchanan, 1981).

3. Student Attitudes

Studies of student attitudes to self and aspects of life in school are plentiful in the literature. Some studies focus on the development

of these attitudes (Dreeben, 1968) but most are concerned with effects on achievement and/or commitment to school. Much of the work done by educational psychologists involves a "mental health" approach with the result that studies of neuroticism, introversion-extroversion, anxiety, self concept and the like are common in this literature. The extensive use of Rotter's (1966) internal-external control scale in the Equality of Educational Opportunity study (Coleman et al., 1966) is an example of the belief in attitudinal effects of this kind (Williams & Batten, 1981). The interest of sociologists in the relationship between personality and social structure, particularly the development of alienation and related constructs, when focused on schools and students tends to reflect the attitudinal effects orientation (Stinchcombe, 1964; Otto & Featherman, 1975). Jackson (1968) and Silberman (1971) provide illustrative reviews regarding student attitudes toward life in schools.

One widely used measure of students' attitude towards school and schooling is the so called "Like School" scale developed for use in the cross-national studies of educational achievement, the IEA studies. The scale is reported in Husen (1967) and consists of eleven items of which the following are examples: "I generally like my school work", "I find schooling interesting and challenging". While there does not appear to be an explicit theoretical basis for the scale, it seems to be measuring general satisfaction with school and, in the context of the IEA studies, is treated as an influence on achievement.

4. Quality of School Life

In 1976 Epstein and McPartland reported on the development of a measure of quality of school life that took its theoretical perspective

from an emerging literature concerned with the quality of (adult) life. Their measure incorporated three scales: a measure of general satisfaction with school containing items such as, "I like school very much"; a scale measuring commitment to classwork of which one item was "work in class is just busy work and a waste of time"; and a reaction to teachers scale focusing on student-teacher relationships, exemplified by the statement "I wish I could have the same teachers next year" (Epstein & McPartland, 1976).

This measure appears to be the first and only one to generalize from models of quality of adult life to the quality of life that students experience in school. The Epstein and McPartland (1976) model of quality of school life was developed as a direct analogue of the more general "quality of life" measures found in the literature on social indicators. These indicators, "measurements of the social life of members of a society" (Land & Spilerman, 1975, p. 1), tend to be derived from one of three measurement domains in the life-space of an individual: objective conditions, subjective value-context, and subjective well-being (Sheldon & Land, 1972, p. 39). Objective conditions are the external physical and social conditions of the individual's existence, such as crime rates, housing quality, and income; subjective value-context refer to the individual's beliefs, expectations, and aspirations; and subjective well being is concerned with the individual's feelings, satisfactions, and frustrations about components of the first two sets. "While 'Quality of Life' has sometimes been used to refer to objective judgements of quality, such as measures of crowding, reported crimes, and decibels of noise pollution, more often it refers to subjectively known and evaluated

aspects of life" (Andrews & Withey, 1976, p. 4).

5. Definition and Conceptualization of Quality of School Life

Gerson (1976) outlines two traditional approaches to defining quality of life: an individualist orientation which sees individual achievement as the determinant of quality of life; and a transcendental orientation which views an individual's quality of life as deriving from his/her contribution to the larger social order. The first of these approaches is adopted in much of the writing on this subject and is the one that pertains to this investigation. Thus, for the present purposes "quality of life is measured by the degree to which an individual succeeds in accomplishing his desires despite the constraints put upon him by a hostile or indifferent nature, God or social order" (Gerson, 1976, p. 794).

Burt et al. (1978) adopt this same definition in arguing that an individual's evaluation of his/her quality of life derives from the level of consumption of socially valued goods and services relative to socially prescribed norms. The more one exceeds the norm the higher ones evaluation of the quality of his/her life. They consider as well a second source of the feelings of well-being that underlie individual reports of quality of life; "the extent to which an individual feels he has the power to determine his individual well-being within society" (Burt et al., 1978, p. 367).

This individualist approach to defining the nature of quality of life, and the sources of individual difference, is characteristic of most of the literature on the subject. Much of the early work undertaken was part of the mental health surveys (Gurin et al., 1960; Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965; Cantril, 1965) which included some

questions about the general state of happiness of the individual. The results of this work generated an interest in happiness or well-being as a subject in its own right, and in the development of appropriate social indicators of quality of life (Williams & Batten, 1981).

Bradburn's (1969) work concerning the psychological reactions of normal individuals to the stresses and strains of everyday life contributed to the development of appropriate social indicators. He argued that individuals have a number of different experiences each day, sometimes they are all positive, sometimes all negative, but mostly they are a mixture of pleasant/unpleasant, soothing/vexing, ego-building/ego-destroying. He expressed the sum of these experiences as three dimensions of well-being: overall feelings of well-being or satisfaction with their life; positive affect, a feeling state tapped by questions about "good" feelings experienced over the past week; and negative affect, a feeling state expressed in reactions to questions about loneliness, boredom and depression. He found that feelings of well-being derived from a relative balance of positive and negative affect and on this basis Bradburn (1969) developed his Affect Balance Scale.

In the mid-seventies two major studies (Campbell et al., 1976; Andrews & Withey, 1976) provided the basis for the current state of research into social indicators of the quality of life. Both extended existing models of quality of life to include measures of general satisfaction and positive and negative affect, as well as measures of satisfaction with specific domains of life activity. These domains covered aspects of an individual's life, such as health, marriage, job, neighborhood, religious faith, operation of local government, and

friends. Measures of these specific domains of life provided additional, detailed information on quality of life experiences, and made it possible to "examine the patterns of relationships between the specific measures of satisfaction and the contribution of each specific measure to an overall measure of life satisfaction" (Campbell et al., 1976, p. 12).

Burt et al. (1978) (1979) summarized the emerging structure of these quality of life models and argued for four dimensions: general satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect, and satisfaction with specific domains. The structure and part of the content of the Williams and Batten (1981) model was developed as a direct analogue of the Burt et al. (1978) (1979) quality of life dimensions. With the exception of the domains, the "school life" parallels of general affect, positive affect and negative affect were straightforward. Williams and Batten (1981) maintained that one could think of and report on overall feelings of satisfaction with school, and the degrees of positive and negative affect that arise as a part of school. General affect measures from quality of life, such as "How do you feel about your life as a whole?" became "How do you feel about your life in school as a whole?" in the quality of school life adaptation.

Specification of the domains of schooling was less straightforward as the school-related analogues of domains such as occupation, education, housing, and government were not readily apparent. In defining these domains, Williams and Batten (1981) returned to the first principles and asked what were the goods and services that schools provided, that students valued, for which there might be socially prescribed norms, and with respect to which students might

feel they had varying degrees of control over their well-being. Williams and Batten (1981) adopted a model of schooling proposed in a series of papers by Spady and Mitchell (1977) to define these domains. This model linked postulated societal level expectations for the functions of schooling--personal development, technical competency, social responsibility and social integration--to the organizational structures developed by schools to accommodate these expectations respectively: instruction, certification, supervision, and socialization structures. The processes embodied in these school structures were attractive to students to the extent that they provided respectively: feelings of adventure in learning, feelings that the competencies developed will lead to desirable and real opportunities in the future, feelings that the attainment of status as a student with attendant rights and responsibilities is possible within the supervision structures, and feelings that the various social integration processes will allow for the development of personal identity. Thus, Williams and Batten (1981) argue for four domains to the quality of school--adventure, opportunity, status and identity--experiences valued by students, provided to varying degrees by schools and ones that would generate feelings of well-being that students could report.

The Williams and Batten (1981) concept of quality of school life should be a good predictor of early school leaving. When considering the quality of school life dimensions they appear to tap the essential psychological factors. One can accept the notion that overall feeling of satisfaction with school and the degree of positive and negative affect that arise as a result of life in school relate to students'

psychological health. This condition in turn should affect students' decisions of whether they wish to remain in such an environment.

Furthermore, school organizational structures operate successfully only if students are attracted to them and respond favorably to the processes which embody them (Williams & Batten, 1981). For example, from the students' perspective, certification processes, which embody performance standards, are only attractive if they enable the student to qualify for desirable and real future opportunities; of course, the concern here is with the relevance of schooling. The key to instructional effectiveness in the personal development of the student is the experience of adventure in learning, an experience which is intrinsically rewarding and leads to self-motivation. The main motivating factor governing the realization of social integration outcomes is identity formation, the development of self-awareness in relation to the larger society. Acquiring a sense of social responsibility--subordinating personal interests to the general welfare--is dependent upon the student achieving status in the group, an acknowledgement of the prerogatives and prestiges of the student (Williams & Batten, 1981).

Williams and Batten (1981) maintain that students have their own expectations of what they want from school; namely, fulfillment as this is defined in experiences of self-worth, intimacy, adequacy and security. "The individual therefore initially responds to the school organization on the basis of its concrete capacity to support or frustrate these personal fulfillment expectations. Thus, personal expectations further constrain and shape the school as an organization, pressuring it to serve as a vehicle for personal fulfillment as well as

for societal achievement" (Spady & Mitchell, 1977, p. 6).

Although the four aspects of student experiences have been described as distinct constructs, each flowing from a particular kind of societal expectation and school structure, in reality there is a considerable degree of overlap between the areas (Williams & Batten, 1981). This overlap becomes apparent when trying to establish a link between student expectations and student experience. Thus, opportunity involves feelings of security in being confident of fair treatment, and feelings of adequacy in coping with qualificatory tasks; adventure involves feelings of adequacy in response to the challenge of learning, and feelings of intimacy arise from encounters in the teaching situation; identity involves feelings of intimacy with peers, and feelings of worth in the context of the school; and status involves feelings of personal worth and feelings of security about one's position (Williams & Batten, 1981).

Given this structure among the variables it seems appropriate that the dimensions of identity, adventure, opportunity and status would embody student expectations and experiences within school. The perceptions of the extent to which these expectations and experiences are fulfilled should likely affect a student's decision of whether to persist with or depart from that environment. Therefore, students' perceptions of their quality of school life should be a good indicator of whether the student will stay in school.

After developing a detailed specification of these domains and providing operational definitions of each, items were written to tap the various aspects of each domain. The first questionnaire contained 81 items and was administered to 1,000 14-year-old students from 250

schools across Australia. The data obtained were used to refine and revise the questionnaire through rewording of some items, and substitution of new items for those that did not perform as expected. As a result, a second 71-item questionnaire was administered to the same sample of students.

Exploratory analyses were used (Williams & Batten, 1981) in the first instance to identify the latent structure and to refine the item pool through the elimination of items not contributing to the definition of the main item clusters. This procedure reduced the number of items from 71 to 45. Factor analysis of these 45 items identified six readily interpretable factors consistent, but not identical, with the theoretical structure proposed. A General affect factor was identified but was defined by both General and Positive affect items. Negative affect was clearly defined by four items. Status and identity were also well defined by items considered a priori to tap these domains. However, the Opportunity and Adventure items re-sorted themselves somewhat as two factors, one to do with teacher-student relationships and defined by Adventure and Opportunity to do with teachers, the other defined by Opportunity items to do with self. This pattern was evidenced again in a subsequent analysis based on 29 items, the four Negative affect items and the five with the highest factor loadings on each of the other five factors (Williams & Batten, 1981).

Subsequent analyses provided confirmation of the fit between these six constructs and their indicators. The resulting validities, defined as the correlations between the composite of the items and the latent construct of the order of .9. Thus, Williams and Batten (1981) feel

reasonably confident that the theory, with slight modification is supported by their data.

Summary

From the above review of the literature it appears that the conceptualization and measurement of the concept of quality of school life is grounded in explicit theory and is supported by empirical validity. The question that has not been answered in the literature is in regard to the relationship between students perceptions of quality of school life and the phenomenon of early school leaving. The determination of this relationship might assist educators and researchers in understanding the nature of school-related variables associated with the early school leaving process.

B. RESEARCH RELEVANT TO EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING

It is a widely held belief in the Western world that a high school education is a bare minimum for contemporary survival. There has therefore been concern about the significant proportion of young people who leave school before graduating. Research studies on early school leavers began to appear in the late fifties and early sixties, largely in the United States (Casella & Shrader, 1975; Cervantes, 1965; Gallion, 1976; Greene, 1966; Hammer, 1970; Lichter, et al., 1962; Schreiber, 1964; Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971; Bledsoe, 1959).

Canadian studies were fewer in numbers during the sixties but the numbers have increased substantially during the seventies (e.g., Drummie, 1975; Guest, 1978; Barnes, 1973; Reich and Young, 1975; Archer, 1978; Friesen, 1967).

Many writers have decried the potential waste of human resources occurring as a consequence of early school leaving; the mass of

under-educated, unemployed, and frustrated youth in the United States is said to constitute "social dynamite" (Voss, Wendling, & Elliott, 1966).

The most comprehensive and convincing conceptualization of early school leaving as a symptom of a fundamental mismatch between student and school, as distinct from being a problem in its own right, came out of the the longitudinal Youth in Transition project (1965-1978) sponsored by the United States Office of Education at the University of Michigan (Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971). The volume devoted to the dropouts in the project's initial sample of 2,213 tenth-grade boys in 87 public high schools is organized around individual causes and effects of leaving school early as part of a larger continuum of educational attainment, comparing dropouts, high school graduates, and college students.

The collision between an individual with "basic problems and limitations" and "the typical high school environment" (Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971, p. 1) described by the authors captures the essence of most of what has been said in the literature. Unfortunately, the authors fall short of articulating the interaction model implicit in their findings: "Whether we assign the responsibility to the individual who" leaves school early, "or to the school environment he leaves, the fact remains that" early school leaving "is symptomatic of something gone wrong" (p. 1).

In this section, student and school characteristics associated with early school leaving will be reviewed as a basis for an attempted integration and interpretation of these two largely discrete research thrusts.

Although the reasons cited for not completing high school differ somewhat from time to time and place to place, a number of demographic variables and personal characteristics fairly consistently associated with leaving school early have been identified. The demographic variables are subsumed by the heading "Family Background Factors." Individual characteristics are discussed under "Ability and School Related Factors" and "Psychological Factors."

1. Family Background Factors

This body of literature will be organized by focusing on the following factors: sex of leavers, socioeconomic level, educational level of parents, family size and status, family relationships, ordinal position and educational level of siblings, place of birth and ethnicity, place of residence, and religious participation.

Sex of leavers. There is clear agreement within the literature that more boys than girls leave school prior to graduation. Almost all of the studies reveal that 55% to 60% of the early school leavers are male (Greene, 1966; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Bachman et al., 1978).

Greene (1966) attempted to explain why more males than females leave school prior to the completion of grade 12. Greene's arguments were that: males are more likely to be given independence earlier than females by their families; or because there are more part-time jobs available for males than females boys are lured into thinking that they can support themselves with full-time work; or perhaps it is the false sense of security gained by a part-time job which is responsible.

Greene (1966) also examined the tasks required in school. He maintained that educators generally concede that schools require tasks

which are more appropriate to girls than to boys, especially at the elementary school level. Furthermore, Greene (1966) claimed that many students do not come in contact with male teachers until secondary school. Closely related to this is the fact that more boys than girls have difficulty in their early school years. Part of this difficulty may be due to the difference in maturity and the rate of growth. However, part of this might also be due to the fact that schools are more attractive to girls than to boys (Greene, 1966). Whatever the reason, there is strong evidence that more boys than girls have difficulty in school which may account for more males leaving school early than females.

Socioeconomic level. According to Bachman et al. (1971), the single most important family background predictor of leaving school early is low socioeconomic class status. This conclusion is consistent with earlier American and Canadian literature (Bledsoe, 1959; Bowman & Matthews, 1965; Green, 1966; Hohol, 1955, Hollingshead, 1949; Sharp & Kristjanson, 1965: Stevens, 1965; Zenter, 1965), and is supported by more recent studies carried out in Ontario and British Columbia (Archer, 1978; Barnes, 1973; Harkins, 1977; Larter & Eason, 1978; Peebles, 1973; Watson, 1975, Zamenzadeh & Prince, 1978). In fact, the relationship between lower socioeconomic status and school withdrawal is so firmly established in the dropout literature, that when Friesen (1967) found corroborating evidence in his Alberta sample he was moved to make the following statements: "This is an expected finding that has been revealed by so many studies that its inclusion is trivial and can be justified only for the sake of completeness" (p. 301).

The virtual universality of this finding does not, however, mean

that dropping out is strictly a lower class phenomenon. In fact, the percentage of dropouts from the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories varies from one-half to two-thirds of the number involved in the studies cited. Nor does it necessarily mean that it is well understood. What it does seem to mean, in a general pragmatic way, is that children whose parents have a relatively low level of education and are employed as blue collar or unskilled workers are more likely to leave school before completing grade 12.

Hohol (1955) observed that while no one cause was responsible for school leaving, "Many are forced by strained financial circumstances to withdraw and go to work" (p. 8). His review of the studies done in the late 1940's and early 1950's supported his findings. "The evidence strongly indicates a relationship between economic status and dropping out" (p. 9). It should be noted that the term socioeconomic does not in this context, imply economic distress.

In the past two decades, however, financial need has not been identified as a significant factor in leaving school (Bachman et al., 1971; Cervantes, 1965). The only exception to this finding has been yielded by Canadian studies conducted in school jurisdictions characterized by a high proportion of recent immigrants. It would, therefore, be incorrect to conclude that economic problems related to lower family income per se are making it necessary for Canadian adolescents to leave school early (Watson, 1975).

What seems to be involved is a complex set of factors that work together to create personal and academic limitations that make it difficult for children from lower class homes to succeed in the kinds of schools and programs that are provided for them. Even if they

present themselves as valuing education in the abstract, early school leavers consistently indicate a dislike of the actual process of schooling (Bowman & Matthews, 1960; Friesen, 1967; Hammontree, 1978; Rancier, 1963). Moreover, their approach to formal learning makes clear that, whatever their actual educational values and aspirations, they have not internalized the process involved in realizing academic goals (Friesen, 1967).

One of these personal limitations may be attitude of hostility or indifference to education itself or to the institutions and programs in which formal schooling occurs (Schreiber, 1964). Thus, Ahrendt (1970) contended that parents with low educational and occupational aspirations "...may subtly transmit their attitudes towards school to their children, and thereby contribute to the development of attitudes which influence a student to drop out" (Ahrendt, 1970). Hohol (1955) made the following observation: "In the absence of a strong positive attitude toward education on the part of the pupil and parents the school has a formidable task in retaining young people until graduation" (p. 10). This conclusion, based on a comprehensive review of the early literature on dropouts, is equally cogent today.

Indirect evidence for this attitudinal factor is consistent and convincing. The "persisters" interviewed by Bowman and Matthews (1965) reported active parental interest in their schooling. The dropouts, on the other hand, presented a picture of parental indifference. Canadian studies confirm this finding of significantly more indifferent and negative attitudes towards school and academic achievement among the parents of dropouts (Barnes, 1973; Larson, 1958). Thus, 38% of the early school leavers in Larson's (1958) Alberta study felt that "a high

school diploma was not very important as preparation for the work they wanted to do later" (p. 213). Twelve percent cited economic difficulties, and another 29% reported lack of parental interest as a major cause.

Similarly, Sharp and Kristjanson (1965) reported that approximately 62% of the male students and 43% of the male dropouts reported strong encouragement to remain in school from their father. Within the female sample, 57% of the students and 34% of the dropouts had been encouraged by their fathers to continue their education. Although the mothers in this Manitoba sample were reported as strongly encouraging continued education more frequently than the fathers, the pattern of relationship was quite similar.

Studies that have addressed this issue directly by asking early school leavers whether or not their parents supported them in their decision to leave school early have not yielded conclusive results (Stobo, 1973). The stance assumed by parents with respect to their child's withdrawal from school seems to vary a great deal from one sample of early school leavers to another.

Moreover, the likelihood of approval or neutrality may vary with certain demographic variables, the age or sex of the student, his or her achievement level, and the grade level involved. Parents' disapprovals peaked in Grade 11, with more mothers disapproving in grade 9 than in grade 12. Thus, in a recent Ontario study (Watson, 1975) 60% of the early school leavers reported that their parents approved their decision to leave school. As for achievement level, the higher the average mark the greater the number of parental approvals reported by early school leavers. Thus, 70% of the A level dropouts,

68% of the Bs and Cs, 63% of the Ds, and 62% of the Fs reported that their parents approved the decision to leave school (p. 279).

The problem with data of this kind is twofold. First, it is the early school leavers' report about their parents' attitude that are being recorded and analyzed and their accuracy can be questioned. Second, as the author observed, "parents may well have 'given up' rather than actually approved" (p. 278). The latter possibility is supported by early school leavers' interview data which suggest a gradual wearing down process leading to apparent parental agreement with the early school leaver's decision.

Although the variability of parental reactions to early school leaving has not been accounted for, it seems to be related to differences in the cluster of variables that are subsumed by the term socioeconomic level. In other words, being a member of a lower or working class family may not mean the same thing in different parts of Canada, and may not include a negative attitude towards education. Thus, in the Ontario study cited above it was found that the children of New Canadians with low incomes but high educational aspirations were underrepresented in early school leaver statistics (Watson, 1975).

More importantly, in most Canadian studies, from one-third to one-half of the early school leavers surveyed or interviewed, depending on the year and locale of the study, tend to be from white collar, managerial, or professional families (Dumka, 1970; Stobo, 1973). On the basis of reported occupation of the fathers of Ontario dropouts, Watson (1975) placed 25% in the Status I Cateogory (professional and technical), 17% in the Status II Category (clerical, sales, services and recreation), 46% in the Status III Category (craftsmen, factory

production, transportation and communication) and 12% in the Status IV Category (unskilled labourers and primary workers). The dropouts' fathers were somewhat more heavily represented in the Status III Category (46.1% to 39.7% for Ontario males in general), almost equally employed in Status II jobs ((10% v 9% percent) and "actually less commonly employed as general labourer or in primary industries 7.2% v 9.6%" (p. 267). Assuming some self-definition upgrading in both Watson's study and general census data, early school leavers' fathers are much more frequently described as having technical and professional jobs (25% v 17%), but are underrepresented in clerical and sales occupations (0.9% v 8.2% and 6.3% v 10.1%) (p. 268).

Clearly, the nature of the socioeconomic variable and the extent to which it contributes to early school withdrawal must be determined for each jurisdiction concerned about the holding power of its schools. It should be noted that this information is not of academic interest only; it is of critical importance to anyone interested in developing general curricula and intervention programs designed to keep adolescents in school.

Economic need. Many studies indicate economic factors as a major reason for early school withdrawal (e.g., Green, 1966: Coombs & Cooley, 1968; Cervantes, 1965; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978).

Although economic factors are reported by early school leavers as reasons for leaving school, many researchers have failed to distinguish between young people who leave school because they have to get a job and those students who leave school because they want to get a job.

At least two studies (Archer, 1978; Reich & Young, 1975) attempted

to distinguish between early leavers who wanted a job and those who needed a job. Although both factors were reported by the early school leavers, there was a stronger tendency for students to report that they wanted a job rather than leave school due to a need for more money.

Educational level of parents. Although level of education completed by the father (and sometimes the mother) is included in most indices of socioeconomic class membership, it merits separate consideration. A number of studies reported a direct correlation between parental level of education and school withdrawal. Bledsoe (1959) found an almost perfect inverse relationship between parents' level of education and percentage of dropouts, with no dropouts from families in which parents had some college education, and increasing overrepresentation of dropouts as the number of years of formal schooling among the parents decreased. Similarly, Nachman (1963) reported that 70% of grade 10 dropouts had parents who had not finished high school. This rose to almost 80% for those who dropped out in grade 9. Schreiber (1964) reviewed the major American studies of the late 1950's and early 1960's and concluded that 70% of the mothers and 80% of the fathers of dropouts had not themselves finished high school. Moreover, 25% of the mothers and 30% of the fathers had not even finished sixth grade.

In a comparative study (Stevens, 1965) the mother's level of formal education differentiated between dropouts and graduates of both sexes. The father's educational level, however, did not distinguish between male graduates and dropouts. Half of the graduates' parents had obtained some post-secondary education, while another 27% had completed high school. In comparison, only 25% of the dropouts'

parents fell in the former category, while another 25% had attended school for less than six years.

In a general way, the above figures have been corroborated in Canadian studies. Sharp and Kristjanson (1965) found that nearly 90% of the fathers of dropouts in Manitoba in the late 1950's and early 1960's had either no (66%) or some (24.4%) high school education, whereas 22% of Ontario fathers had completed high school. The corresponding proportions for the fathers of dropouts was 10% for boys and 8% for girls. Similarly, Barnes (1973) determined that the fathers of the dropouts in his British Columbia sample had significantly less education than the fathers of the graduate controls. This finding was confirmed in several Ontario studies (Reich & Young, 1975; Larter & Eason, 1978; Archer, 1978).

Watson (1975), however, concluded that her Ontario results "upset the classical findings" (p. 268). On the basis of reported schooling, 9% of the parents of her provincial sample of dropouts had attended university or obtained a degree, 26% had upper secondary or post-secondary non-university schooling, 51% had completed grades 7-10, and 14% had a grade six or less education. The dropouts' fathers in this study, therefore, compared very favourable in educational status with the Ontario male population of similar age although fewer had completed high school (15.6% vs 18.2%), and a larger proportion had some secondary schooling (32.7% vs 28.5%) (p. 267). Thus, only a small subgroup fit the description of the 'classical' dropout of American studies who is said to come from the lowest social stratum of society, whether status is defined by social position or by level of education. Finally, the typical Ontario dropout's family does not subsist on

public welfare and his father is not likely to be an unskilled labourer with incomplete elementary education well below the median for his community.

A word of caution, however, is in order. The family background data reported by Watson (1975) were gleaned from interviews conducted with a 3% random sample drawn from the dropout lists of cooperating schools. Unfortunately, the difficulty of tracing dropouts and persuading them to participate in the study meant that only 423 out of the intended 600 interviews took place. In addition to the fact that more girls than boys were interviewed, it apparently was easier to track down rural early school leavers. Watson (1975) does not speculate about how these constraints affected the data obtained, but the possibility that the 'classical' group is underrepresented in the interview sample must be considered in interpreting the results.

Family size and status. Although the status of the home, (for example, whether it was intact or broken by death or separation) had been related to dropping out in a number of studies, Stevens' (1965) review of the literature yielded conflicting evidence. Reported findings about the relationship between early school leaving and family size were also inconclusive (Stevens, 1965).

In the course of developing a prediction model, Stevens (1965) found that in Colorado size of family was a significant predictor of school withdrawal. More dropouts (47.7%) than graduates (21.8%) came from large (six or more) families, and this difference held for both sexes. His data, however, did not yield any significant relationship between status of home and school completion. Bowman and Matthews (1960) confirmed the relationship between family size and early school

leaving. The dropouts in their study more frequently came from families of five or six or more children, a finding consistent with their socioeconomic status. Bachman et al. (1971) reported that the dropout rate in their study was twice as high for boys from large families or broken homes. A study conducted in Hamilton, Ontario in 1965 revealed that 51.7% of the early school leavers in that system came from families of four or more children. Watson's (1975) province-wide survey in Ontario confirmed the results of smaller studies in individual school jurisdictions. The average number of children in the dropouts' families was found to be 4.3, much higher than the 3.6 figure for the general population. A subsequent study in the borough of York (Archer, 1978) yielded an even greater discrepancy. Whereas the average family size in the borough was 3.2, for dropouts it was five or greater. Over half of the dropouts came from families with four or more children, with one-quarter reporting five or more children per family. Simlarly, "Early School Leavers," a special group of fourteen- and fifteen-year old students in Ontario permitted to leave school and get a job have also been found to come from larger than average families--4.7 for students born in Canada and 5.1 for those born in other countries (Larter & Eason, 1978).

The consistency of these findings prompted Ontario analysts concerned with developing forecasting techniques to predict dropout flows at a school system level to build family size into their prediction equations. It was found that a geographical area in which average family size is relatively large is likely to experience higher dropout rates. In fact, in attempts to explain variability in dropout rate, family size emerged as a more important variable than school-

related factors such as length of time required to complete a program, pupil-teacher ratios, and average expenditure for pupil which were not as clearly and consistently related to differences in dropout rates from school to school and jurisdiction to jurisdiction (Kumar, Padro & Watson, 1977).

The findings with respect to family status, such as whether the home is intact or broken by separation, divorce or death, are less consistent. The Los Angeles study (1965) found that 43% of dropouts were not living with both natural parents as compared to 12% of girls and 28% of boys who graduated (Peebles, 1973). An exploratory study in the South Okanagan region of British Columbia (Barnes, 1967) revealed that 63% of the dropouts, as compared with 12% if the controls came from unstable homes. Within the dropout group, more girls than boys reported unstable home status.

Over one-third of the Toronto early school leavers interviewed by Larter and Eason (1978) were not living with both parents. On the other hand, Watson (1975) found that most dropouts (71%) lived at home with both parents, and in 89% of the cases, both parents were alive. Boys from broken homes in the Bachman et al. (1971) study were twice as likely to drop out of high school. As with family size, however, at least some of the association was found to be the result of socio-economic level, in that homes broken by divorce or separation were more likely to be in the lower social strata.

When the relationship between broken homes and school achievement is examined from the perspective of the school achievement of children from such homes, however, a different picture seems to emerge. Thus, although Kelly, North, and Zingle (1965) observed some adverse effects

of family breakup during the first three grades on school achievement, attendance, and behavior, the nature and strength of this relationship varied with socioeconomic class and the aspect of school performance considered when socio-economic class status is controlled, family disruption per se does not have a uniform deleterious effect upon the child's subsequent reading performance" (p. 218). Moreover, no differences were found between children from broken and intact homes on teacher rated school behaviour problems. McCutcheon (1976) concluded that "objective information on the implications of a broken home on human development is...disappointingly scarce" (p. 23) and urged that judgments be reserved to avoid bringing into play a self-fulfilling prophecy. Knudsen (1964) did not find a relationship between withdrawal and broken homes. However, it was noted that steady dating was frequently found among dropouts, and marriage was the most common reason recorded on the withdrawal notice.

In short, the apparently negative effects of being a child in a single-parent family documented in American studies in large urban ghettos may not be generalizable to other dropout samples, in that family instability is so closely related to family size and overall socioeconomic status in these areas that its separate effect is very difficult to determine. In any event, like the general socioeconomic variable discussed above, the relationship between family instability and early school withdrawal must be examined in relation to other regional demographic and family unit characteristics.

Family relationships. Regardless of whether or not the home was intact, Bachman et al. (1971) found that the quality of relationships among family members was an important variable related to early school

withdrawal. In fact one of the factors predicting dropping out of high school when the boys in the study were in grade 10 was a measure of parental punitiveness, on which the parents of dropouts earned high scores. The ten items in the instrument used asked how often the respondent felt that parents ignored him, acted as if they did not care about him, slapped him, criticized him, punished him, and disagreed on how to deal with him. The results were interpreted cautiously, for it was recognized that although the obvious and preferred conclusion would be that parental punitiveness above a "low" or "average" level tends to inhibit educational attainment, the implied cause-effect relationship might be of a different order. Certainly tenth graders who are doing well in school would be less likely to incur parental disapproval and provide occasion for punitive behaviours.

Whatever the direction of the relationship, there is reason to believe that the homes of early school leavers are more likely to be characterized by family relationships that are not conducive to personal and academic success. Knudsen (1964) reported a positive predictive association between school progress toward graduation and affectional dependence on parents. Dropouts appeared to be more exclusively peer oriented than normal progress students who had high orientations to both parents and friends. Moreover, family decision making structures were considered to be democratic and egalitarian most frequently by both male and female normal progress students compared to other categories. Similarly, Dumka (1970) noted that dropouts felt less well understood and accepted at home than their graduate peers.

The most telling evidence, however, comes from a study (Cervantes, 1965) designed to explore the "sociocultural and psychodynamic factors

involved in withdrawal from the academic milieu" (p. 6). Two of the six general areas of investigation were the nuclear family and the friend-family system; part of the world of emergent youth as reported and seen by themselves" (p. 10) in a blue-collar metropolitan area. The conclusions reached are not reassuring. It was found that the dropout was reared in a family which has less solidarity, less primary relatedness, and less paternal influence than does the family of the graduate. Moreover, the dropout's family had fewer close friends and fewer "problem-free" friends than his academically successful peers.

More specifically, an overwhelming majority (over 80%) of the dropouts did not perceive their whole families as both understanding and accepting each other. Approximately the same percentage of the graduate controls saw their families as accepting each other as complete persons (Cervantes, 1965). Similarly, four out of five dropouts felt rejected by their families, and judged themselves as accepting and understanding their families "little" or "very little," while over 80% of the graduates reported that they and their families mutually understood and accepted each other.

With respect to depth of communication, 20% of the graduates experienced problems in this area in their homes. A similar percentage of dropouts reported that their homes were characterized by "adequate or highly agreeable family communication" (Cervantes, 1965). What these figures suggest is that, while there is clearly some overlap between the groups, 80% of the dropouts "received their life's basic orientation in a nuclear family of inadequate communication" (p. 29).

Pleasurable cooperative experiences, the third characteristic of a supportive primary group, were found to be a regular part of the

graduates' family life (75%). This was not true for the dropouts, 79% of whom stated that their families participated in leisure activites together "infrequently" or "very infrequently" (Cervantes, 1965, p. 31).

Family solidarity, estimated from the extent to which members confide in each other, was not part of the dropout's experience. The emotional climate of the homes of the dropouts was so disagreable that all but 10% of them felt that there was no one in the home who cared for them except perhaps the mother. In comparison, nearly 60% of the graduates reported that they could confide in every one of their family members (Cervantes, 1965, p. 34). Similarly, the typical home of the dropout was reported as unhappy (52%), and that of the graduate as happy (64%).

Each of the above comparisons of the primary relations within homes of adolescents of similar socioeconomic background "distinguished the dropout from the graduate at the highest level of significance (.001)" (Cervantes, 1965, p. 36). The author concluded that "no matter what other variables are at work, the nuclear family is of critical importance in the consideration of the dropout problem" (Cervantes, 1965, p. 37). Another conclusion, in terms of implications for further research is that it is within-group comparisons of this kind that yield at least tentative answers to the question of why some students withdraw from school early while their demographicaly similar peers persist to graduation.

Ordinal position and educational level of siblings. Bowman and Matthews (1960) reported that early school leavers were less frequently the only or first-born. When Stevens (1965) examined attainments of

the older siblings of dropouts, all comparisons yielded significant differences. Of the graduates, only one-quarter had older siblings who were dropouts. In comparison, over two-thirds of the dropouts, older siblings that left school early. The most common family position for the dropout in the Watson (1975) study was 'middle child' (45%). Only 20% were the eldest in their family. Almost half of the dropouts who were interviewed had a brother or sister who had left school early (83% of the siblings were the eldest in the family).

The Toronto early school leavers (Larter & Eason, 1978) tended to have older siblings who, though they had not left school before the age of 16, had not graduated from high school (p. 30).

Place of birth and ethnicity. Interest in possible relationships between place of birth or ethnicity and school withdrawal increased as prediction models began to enable identification of high risk groups. Sharp and Kristjanson (1965) found a significant difference in ethnic background of students and dropouts only in the case of the male sample group, where "Icelandic, Russian-Ukrainian, and French" were overrepresented among the dropouts. Conversely, the British group was overrepresented in the student category. Although not reaching the level of statistical significance, a similar pattern held for girls.

One-third of the Toronto early school leavers had been born in Portugal (Larter and Eason, 1978). This group, which constituted only 5.9% of the general school population, was therefore overrepresented in this small number of students who had left school a year or two prior to the legal age of 16. By way of contrast, Canadian-born students were underrepresented among the early school leavers (58%, as opposed to 70.1% in the general school population). This finding may, however,

be an anomolous one confined to the special situation of early school leavers. In the Reich and Young (1975) study, also carried out in Toronto, only 42% of the dropouts were New Canadian, yet this group constituted 48% of the total secondary school population. On a province-wide basis, Watson (1975) found an even weaker relationship between "New Canadianism" and early school withdrawal. More of the dropouts in the provincial sample had fathers who were Canadian-born than was general for their age cohorts in the Ontario population (72% versus 69%). This was also true of dropouts' mothers (73% versus 71%). Finally, the most common language spoken in the home was English, and only a few early school leavers were from unilingual non-English speaking families (p. 267).

Religious background and participation. Relatively few of the studies reported in the literature examined religious orientation in relation to school persistence. The few that have suggest a stronger overall relationship between level of involvement and staying in school than between a particular religious affiliation and completion of high school.

Sharp and Kristjanson (1965) found small but statistically significant relationships between religious background and staying in school. Students with United Church and Anglican backgrounds were somewhat overrepresented among the persisters, while of Roman Catholic, Ukrainian Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Lutheran persuasion contributed disproportionately to dropout figures. Overall, students reported active practice of a religion with greater frequency than dropouts.

2. Intellectual Ability and School-Related Factors

Early school leavers frequently mention their inability to perform

well in school as one of their reasons for terminating their schooling. University entrance and completion depend on intellectual skills to a considerable degree.

Investigators do not agree on the importance of intelligence as a factor related to early school leaving. Studies show a wide range of IQ of those individuals leaving school early. Wollatt (1961) found that 12.1% of the early school leavers had an IQ of 110 and above, while 30.4% were below 90; the Los Angeles City School District study (1965) in which 34% of the graduates had IQs of 108 and above while only 10% of the early leavers were in that range; and Whitmore & Chapman (1965) Modesto, California study found that 69% of the early leavers had IQs of 90 or above.

Schreiber (1969) concluded that at least one-half of all early leavers have the intelligence to graduate from high school and at least 10% are capable of university level work. This is supported by the studies of Zeller (1966), Cervantes (1965) and Bachman et al. (1971).

On the other hand, Cook (1954) and Delaney (1950) reported that limited intellectual capacity is a definitive characteristic of early school leavers. Both Cook (1954) and Delaney (1950) report that the obvious difference between early school leavers and graduates lies in the proportion whos IQs are under 85 and hence they concluded early leavers lack the requisite ability to complete high school. Not to be overlooked in this comparision of early leavers and graduates is the overlap of IQ scores. Many of the early leavers had higher IQs than some of the high school graduates, and some early leavers had the intellectual equipment necessary to do university work. Nevertheless they claimed that their investigation offered evidence that low

intelligence is related to early school leaving. Delaney's (1950) findings indicate that only 46% of the early leavers surveyed had average or above average intellectual ability. These contradictory findings may stem partially from the use of different definitions of early school leavers. In addition, some of the discrepencies between these investigations presumably may result from the use of different, though often unspecified intelligence tests which may have different norms (Voss, Wendling, & Elliott, 1966).

Dillon (1949) provides evidence that students with limited ability are the first to leave school. He found that 36% of 1,018 dropouts in grades seven through 12 had IQ scores below 85; in contrast, 75% of the dropouts who left school in the seventh grade scored below this level.

It is important to recognize that IQ scores correlate highly with reading ability. Those who have learned to read well will do better on tests which require reading than children who are poorer readers. Lanier (1949) found that language IQ of early school leavers was considerably below that of those who remained in school. In addition, the non-language IQ scores of the early leavers were higher than their language IQ scores. This suggests that difficulties with reading may also be an important factor related to leaving school.

Bachman et al. (1978) report that ability is the best single predictor of educational attainment, and it has the strongest direct effect on the eventual outcome. But with ability controlled, the effects of background remain quite substantial, indicating that within each level of ability there is considerable advantage in having a better family background, especially in terms of high socioeconomic level, fewer siblings, and low parental punitiveness. Several studies

have reported similar findings (e.g., Green, 1966; Peebles, 1973; Kumar, Padro & Watson, 1977; Sewell, Palmo, & Manni, 1981).

Reading achievement. There is evidence that reading achievement is significantly related to the early school leavers' academic difficulties. Using the California Reading Achievement Test, Bledsoe (1959) found that dropouts from the ninth and tenth grade had a mean score of 8.9. Penty (1959) also found a relationship between reading ability, as measured by the Iowa Silent Reading Test, and withdrawal from high school: more than three times as many poor readers as good readers left school prematurely. Nachman (1964) and his co-workers found that 75.4% of the early leavers scored below the median of their level on a reading test, and 53.4% were in the lowest quarter.

Penningroth (1963) examined selected characteristics of students with reading disabilities who left school and those who graduated. Groups were matched according to reading scores attained in Grade 9, intelligence, attendance and attitudes towards parents and teachers. There were no significant differences between the two groups in reading ability or intelligence. There was, however, a marked difference in their primary grade experience. The retarded junior high school readers who stayed on to graduate were significantly better readers in the primary grades than the early leavers. "They had had, in effect, a successful school experience early in their school life, while the early leavers had encountered failure" (Peningroth, 1963). Pupils who are poor readers have difficulty in doing the work required at school. One of the consequences of poor reading is failure and grade retardation (Ahrendt, 1970).

Grade failure. Perhaps the most dramatic and traumatic indication

of early failure in schools occurs when a youngster is held back a grade. Failing an exam or receiving a poor report card can be very upsetting, but such things can be overcome. When an individual is not promoted to the next grade along with the rest of the class, however, everyone knows he has failed. It is almost certain that he will never catch up with his class again.

In the literature on early school leavers, one finds numerous studies which point to grade retardation as one of the outstanding characteristics of early school leavers (e.g., Zeller, 1966; Greene, 1966; Reich & Young, 1975, Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Bachman et al., 1978). Livingston (1958) reported that of all early school leavers who withdrew prior to entering ninth grade, everyone was retarded at least one grade and 84% were retarded two grades. Of those who graduated from high school, only 1% were retarded one grade and none were retarded more than a single grade (Livingston, 1958). In its survey of seven communities, the U. S. Department of Labor (1958) includes grades eight through twelve in four areas and grades nine through twelve in the remaining three; it was found that 84% of the dropouts were retarded at least one year, and 53% were retarded two or more years. Specifically, 87% of the boys and 80% of the girls were retarded one or more years and 59% of the boys were retarded two or more years as were 44% of the girls.

Retardation is considered one of the most reliable indicators of future early school leaving (U.S. Department of Labor, 1958). Bachman et al. (1971)(1978) report that past educational success or failure is a most important predictor of educational attainment. An estimated 40% of those who had repeated a grade dropout as compared to 10% of

those never held back. Eighty per cent of the A students in grade nine went on to university while only 8% of D students continued at the university level (Bachman et al., 1971).

Zamanazadeh and Prince (1978) reported 59% of the dropouts failed two or more subjects in high school while only 17% of the non-dropouts reported failing two or more. Forty-five per cent of the dropouts failed once or more in elementary school; only 10% of the non-dropouts failed once or more in elementary school. Eighty per cent of the dropouts, but only 12% of the non-dropouts, failed one year or more during their school careers,

The most important factors relating to educational attitudes seem to be skipping school regularly, and the amount of time spent studying per week; 31% of the dropouts reported not studying at all as compared with 8% of the non-dropouts (Zamanzadeh & Prince, 1978).

Dropouts reported global problems regarding school difficulties whereas non-dropouts reported more specific kinds of difficulties (Zamanzadeh & Prince, 1978).

Classroom grades. Early school leavers do not come primarily from the ranks of the A students. In fact Bachman et al. (1978) report that of the 154 students who reported grade averages of A, only one failed to obtain his high school diploma. Two-thirds of the A students graduated from university. On the other end of the scale, 30% of the D students lacked a high school diploma, and another 39% obtained no further education after high school.

Zamanazadeh and Prince (1978) reported that 63% of the dropouts began to have difficulty with their teachers in elementary school, only 12% of the non-dropouts experienced similar difficulties. Ninety-eight

per cent of the dropouts were critical of the way they were handled, whereas only 15% of the non-dropouts felt this way. Most dropouts seemed to be asking for more control, in the sense of more attention, care, and understanding with firmness; other only demanded individual care and affection, but no discipline.

Participation in school activities. There are an overwhelming number of studies which reveal that dropouts do not participate in school activities (e.g., Cervantes, 1965; Greene, 1966; Bachman et al., 1972; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978). Greene (1966) reports that potential early school leavers do not become members of football teams or hobby clubs; these students do not even attend athletic activities of the school or become involved in its social activities.

A partial explanation (Greene, 1966) is that potential early school leavers do not feel that they "belong." Their social relationships with other students are poor and their friends are more likely to be out of school or in another school. Greene (1966) maintains they lack a sense of identification with their school, that esprit de corps which comes from feeling an integral part of a group. In a very real sense, they are alienated from school and school personnel. To them school appears to represent unpleasantness and they do not appear to have the desire to return to school after it is officially over, nor to spend any more time there than they have to.

Dissatisfaction with school. One of the factors that almost every recent study of early school leavers reveals as being of major importance is that of dissatisfaction with school (Greene, 1966; Combs & Cooley, 1968; Bachman et al., 1972; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson,

1975; Archer, 1978). This factor tends to overlap with other factors because of its broadness in scope. It includes, among other factors: dislike for teachers, dislike for certain subjects, failing courses, not getting along with other students, or irrelevant school course offerings (Greene, 1966).

Rebellious behavior in school. Bachman et al. (1978) reported administering a questionnaire segment consisting of 13 items asking respondents to report how frequently they engaged in discipline-related behavior in school, broke rules, or did poor school work. The items covered such topics as fighting or arguing with other students, goofing off in class, skipping class, coming unprepared, copying assignments, and cheating on tests. The B items made up an index of rebellious behavior in school. Students with the most rebellious behavior were less likely to attain a higher education. Eighty per cent of the least rebellious group went on to some post-high school education, but only half that proportion of the most rebellious did so (Bachman et al., 1978).

Program of study. Bachman et al. (1978) report that their findings indicate that a student's chances of completing university are closely linked to being in the university preparatory program in the tenth grade. More than one-third (37%) of those in the college program in tenth grade actually obtained bachelor degrees within five years of high school. From a different perspective, 45% of the sample were in the university program in the tenth grade, but they represent 73% of those who obtained bachelor degrees. Most of the other bachelor degrees were obtained by those in the general program (Bachman et al., 1978).

Delinquent behavior. Bachman et al. (1978) obtained an index measure of delinquent behavior in school, this index was comprised of items dealing with disruptive or delinquent behaviors in school, ranging from skipping a day and smoking against the rules to hitting a teacher or damaging school property. The authors findings reveal a rather strong, and negative relationship to eventual school attainment. The proportion of those in the most delinquent group who stopped their education at a high school diploma is four times that of the least delinquent group, 64% versus 16%. Bachman et al. (1978) point out that the importance of delinquent behavior is independent of background and ability. Within levels of background and ability, the more delinquent are likely to attain less education (Bachman et al., 1972).

3. Psychological Factors

Alienation. Several studies have focused on alienation as an important factor which may have accounted for early school withdrawals (Greene, 1966; Mikalachki, 1973; Griffin, 1973; Friesen, 1967, Friedman, 1966). In most instances the subject of alienation is not addressed directly, but the general consensus is that early school leavers felt that they did not find relevence in school activities and that they did not have a sense of identification or belonging within the school setting (Greene, 1966). Two noted writers, among others, (Friedenberg, 1959; Goodman, 1956) have criticized the American school systems for having adapted themselves only too well to the needs of society, and hence the schools appear to cater to the American middle class attitudes and values while neglecting the belief systems that do adhere to those dominant cultural values. Herein emerges the concept of alienation, whereby those functions which do not ascribe to the

value systems espoused in the schools develop feelings of non-belonging.

Friedman (1966) elaborating further on the aspect of alienation maintains that our schools are teaching conformity to the system while trying to appear to teach democracy. "The child is alienated today because the school and society have failed to provide him with a world in which he can take a genuine interest" (Friedman, 1966, p. 80). Goodman (1956) claims that school and society have not been able to convince many students that the prsent educational system is in harmony with their inner needs and sense of growth. Goodman (1956) claims that we are asking our children to grow up "absurd" into a dead and mechanical way of life. Friedman (1966) believes that one of the methods of coping with feelings of alienation within school is to display indifference or to simply withdraw.

Friesen (1967) compared a number of experiences and attitudes of potential early school leavers with those of students who did not wish to leave school before grade 12 graduation. Major differences were reported between the two groups in regard to their perceptions of school experiences, church activities, academic orientation, conformity, parent influence, teacher influence, and partly in peer-group influence. The potential early school leaver perceived a variety of situations in a more negative light than the students wishing to remain in school. Specifically, boys who desired to leave school participated less frequently in football and basketball than those who did not wish to leave. A significantly greater percentage of the "stay" boys than the "leave" boys stated that they wished to join a church, that they had attended Sunday School, and that they attended

church. Academic achievement variation was significant for the boys as well as the girls. Even though the "leave" students tend to recognize the value of being an outstanding student, they had not internalized the process (working, striving, or developing an attitude to work toward academic goals). The students wishing to leave school were found to be more non-conforming toward the goals of the school than the students wishing to stay. In regard to parental influence, the "stay" group perceived parental influence as stronger than the students in the "leave" group. The "leave" boys found teacher disapproval hardest to take and perceived school experiences as unsatisfactory in significantly larger numbers than the "stay" boys. A significantly smaller percentage of the "stay" girls than the "leave" girls found school experiences unsatisfactory.

Both boys and girls in the "leave" group spent significantly more evenings a week with a "gang" than those in the "stay" groups. Boys of the "leave" group chose more frequently than those of the "stay" group to go with friends rather than with parents. The "leave" girls in significantly larger numbers than the "stay" girls perceived the influence of friends as most important.

Friesen (1967) concluded that his findings reveal that the "leave" student is alienated from teachers and parents. Friesen (1967) explains that the "leave" student's preoccupation with activities outside the sphere of the role as a student accounts for the lack of interest in school. He further maintains that poor school adjustment stems from orientation to outside interests and the failure to establish relevancy of school experiences. An alternative explanation is advanced by Friesen (1967); when the student finds school, home and

church activities less than satisfying, activities which provide the needed pleasure and status will be sought. In both instances the "leave" students' school experiences are unsatisfactory, and fail to stimulate the student toward learning.

Mikalachki (1973) compared the responses of high school students according to two classifications, "alienated" and "mainstream." The alienated described themselves as "hassled" while the mainstream students referred to their school situation as "okay." Mikalachki's findings revealed four general means of difference between the "hassled" and "okay" groups: attitude toward family, attitude toward school, goals for the future, and drug usage. The "hassled" group expressed a much more negative attitude toward family life than the "okay" group. The crucial factor appeared to be unsatisfactory communication with parents. The hassled group felt predominantely negative toward school while the "okay" group reported feeling mainly positive. The "hassled" group reported finding rules and authority a constant source of problems within the school. The "okay" group tended to report specific future goals while the majority of the "hassled" group reported having none. The "okay" group generally reported they were not taking drugs while 74% of the "hassled" group admitted to drug usage. Mikalachki (1973) concluded that alienation begins in the home and that alienation from the family precedes alienation from society and school.

Griffin (1973) takes the position that students are "turning away" from schools, teachers, parents, police, and post-secondary education; concluding that a type of alienation exists. He supports his position by maintaining that there are many signs indicating that students are

alienated from school. Included in his argument is that leaving school early is an indication of dissatisfaction with school. He claims that school attendance problems are persisting and are increasing in most schools; that truancy and skipping classes have become the major disciplinary problem for schools. He reports that students frequently state they are bored with school; the main criticism being that school activities in many cases are not personalized. Students have difficulty grasping the meaning or purpose of school activities; a problem which exists in both the curricular and extracurricular activities within the school. Griffin (1973) claims that students are looking to new ways to make life more meaningful, more fulfilling, or more exciting. Some are relying on drugs or alcohol as they look for a better life. Although Griffin (1973) does not provide empirical data for his views, his observations appear to coincide with the observations of many authorities on the subject.

Teacher behavior. Whiteside and Merriman (1976) reported that early school leavers were ruthless in recalling the instructors they despised. Most of their criticism was directed toward teachers who had belittled them. The early school leavers in the Whiteside and Merriman (1976) study reported teacher behavior which resulted in the early leavers feeling negative about themselves. The teacher behaviors reported were: teachers flaunting their superiority; unable to understand a student's inability to do certain school work; intolerance of student inadequacies. The authors reported that the early school leavers in their study singled out self confidence as the most important attribute of an effective teacher. It was concluded that people who trust their own competence generally do not need to belittle

others in order to feel secure. Whiteside and Merriman (1976) thought the early school leavers were saying that teachers are able to accept other people only when they can truly accept themselves. It was those teachers who lacked self confidence in themselves that belittled the students most often. The early school leavers, being most vulnerable to that kind of criticism, perhaps suffered the most (Whiteside & Merriman, 1976).

Drug use. Adolescent drug use and early school leaving are two areas of inquiry that have attracted research activities in recent years. Numerous studies have been conducted on the characteristics of high school drug users (e.g., Russell, 1970; Smart, Fejer & White, 1973; Wiener, 1970) and the relationship between drug useage and student withdrawal from school (e.g., Bachman, Green, & Wirtanen, 1971; Cervantes, 1965; Reich & Young, 1975; Archer, 1978; Watson, 1975). There is, however, surprisingly little overlap between these bodies of literature in that few studies have systematically investigated the question of early school leaving in relation to drug usage.

Surveys of high school and college populations have consistently reported a positive association between the use of illegal drugs and dissatisfaction with school, teachers and course work, and lack of involvement in conventional educational pursuits (Blum, 1969; Brotman, 1969; Friesen, 1967). Furthermore, potential dropouts have been found to report more use of most drugs (Blum, 1969; Friesen, 1967; Annis & Watson, 1975).

More direct evidence of the relationship between early school leavers and drug use is provided by two studies investigating actual school withdrawal. Robins, Darnish and Murphy (1970), in a

retrospective study of the long-term outcome of adolescent drug use among a sample of young men, found that more adolescent marihuana users than non users failed to graduate from high school. A longitudinal study by Annis and Watson (1975) attempted to determine the relationship between drug use and early school leaving in a general high school population in northern Ontario. The results supported previously reported findings by demonstrating greater use of most licit and illicit drug categories by early school leavers. Furthermore, it was shown that for almost every drug, the trend towards greater drug use within the early school leaving group was evident and equally strong before the school leaving occurred. There was, however, some indication that early school leavers were additionally more likely to start or initiate some categories of drug use following their early departure from school.

It was concluded that while drug use functions as part of the constellation of contributing factors that precedes early school leaving, the early school leaver status itself may play a causal role in fostering self-identification and/or social group contacts which promote the development of drug abuse patterns. Loken (1973) found similar results which indicated that drug use was related to time lost from school as well as to early school leaving. Loken (1973) also found that grade ten was a crucial year in considering the drug and early school leaving phenomena. Student absences during grade ten were significantly and positively correlated with the corresponding use of at least 16 separate drugs that were investigated. At other grade levels only four to six drugs were found to be related to non-attendance (Loken, 1973).

Contextual effects. There is little consensus among the researchers regarding school contextual effects on level of post-secondary educational and occupational aspirations. Several studies (Boyle 1966; Coleman et al., 1966; McDill & Coleman, 1965; Michael, 1961; Turner, 1964; Wilson, 1959) maintain that school effects, albeit small in some instances, are important factors in determining differential levels of achievement or aspiration. On the other hand, studies by Hauser (1969), McDill, Meyers, and Rigsby (1967), Myer (1970), and Nelson (1972) claim that the magnitude of school environmental effects are negligible factors in determining students' overall levels of achievement or aspiration.

O'Neill (1978) also examined school contextual effects on levels of post-secondary aspirations. His results showed that, even though school environmental effects were trivial and unreliable, the variables parental expectations, family socioeconomic status, and school peer group do make substantial contributions to the variance in both educational and occupational aspirations. O'Neill (1978) concluded that the conjugal (nuclear) family, where many behavioral attitudes and values are engendered, has an influence on levels of aspirations and subsequent social class achievement by members of the next generation. More explicitly, socioeconomic level and the parent's expectations are the primary determiners of a student's level of educational and occupational aspirations. O'Neill (1978) also noted that school peer group accounted for considerably more variance than school environment. He infered that, even though school environment may not be an important factor in influencing levels of aspiration, the adolescent clique or subgroup was an important factor in determining differential

levels of post-secondary aspirations. Specifically, it is the student's direct association within the smaller school society that is the important factor, not the overall socioeconomic composition of the school population itself (O'Neill, 1978).

Personality characteristics. In the abundant literature on the early school leaver, a relatively small number of citations directly related personality traits or personality ratings to academic failure. Most authors do, however "draw conclusions that related to fundamental character factors" (Richter & Scandrette, 1971, p. 127).

The California Test of Personality was administered by Bowman and Mathews (1960) to dropouts and controls in grade 6, three years before any sizable number of the potential leavers actually left school. The controls, both boys and girls, had scores in the most favorable quartile (23%) more than three times as often as dropouts (8%). The controls were less likely to score lowest (29%), whereas 37% of the dropouts earned scores indicative of maladjustment. In a follow-up Bowman and Mathews (1960) administered the California Psychological inventory to grade 10 controls and subsequent dropouts still in school. The control group had twice as many scores in the most favorable quartile (21%), and two-thirds as many in the least favorable one (34%). Half of the dropouts had scores in the lowest quartile. On the basis of these findings, Bowman and Mathews (1960) concluded that "Since it seems likely that those leaving school before the tenth grade would have been even less well adjusted than those leaving later on in high school, differences in personality adjustment between dropouts and controls would seem to be quite significant" (p. 33).

From their therapy treatment experiences of 70 early school

leavers (Lichter, Rapien, Siebart & Sklansky, 1962) reached several conclusions. Together they constitute a profile of adolescents who figure prominantly in dropout statistics. A third of the students showed symptoms of personal discomfort. These students were burdened with apprehension, fears, and anxieties, or with a negative self image shown in self depreciation, lack of self-confidence and inferiority feelings.

Approximately one-half of the girls were displaying disruptive behavior. They were reacting to stress overtly through impulsive behavior, restlessness, disobedience, untruthfulness and running away. The boys referred for treatment were predominantly those who were not seriously aggressive or delinquent. The treatment boys were characterized by poor coping ability reflected in either dependency or motivation. They displayed helpless demanding behavior or a pattern of lack of motivation, procrastination and resistance to normal reality demands which had been characteristic of this group since the early elementary grades. In summary, few adolescents in the treatment group displayed reactions appropriate of their age (Lichter, Rapien, Siebart & Sklansky, 1962). Lichter et al., reported that a high proportion of early school leavers diagnosed as having problems with character formation is particularly significant, for it shows that their school difficulties were not a simple problem.

> It was not a matter of laziness, poor study habits, inadequate parental control, faulty teacher discipline, poor school curricula.... Rather, the problems were entrenched in the entire character formation and were related to personality development. Such problems do not respond to the usual inducements of the school or to the efforts of parents to correct them. Moreover, they do not respond quickly, if at all, to therapeutic counselling (p. 73).

Richter and Scandrette (1971) found similar findings to that reported above. In a comparison of 31 dropouts with 39 graduates Richter and Scandrette (1971) attempted to determine whether routine teacher personality ratings distinguish between the two groups. Statistically significant differences favoring graduates were found on all nine personality traits. The most pronounced differences were in regard to motivation, responsibility, emotional stability and concern for others, while less dramatic differences were found in regard to industry, integrity, initiative, influence and leadership. Although an independent objective measure of these personality traits would have been preferable, the findings are of sufficient interest to warrant further investigation into the relationship of personality traits to academic achievement.

Zamanzadeh and Prince (1978) found that dropouts had more childhood anxiety symptoms (bedwetting, nail biting, nightmares, and so on), had more frequent periods of illness, had less confidence, and were more likely to daydream than did non-dropouts.

4. Cause or Symptom

The controversy over whether dropping out is a cause or a symptom of the problem of the disadvantaged is evident in the literature. In the United States a Senate Select Committee on Equal Education Opportunity (1972) has published an exchange of views between Levin and Bachman. Levin attempts to estimate the social costs to the nation of the dropouts in terms of crime, welfare, and unemployment. Bachman maintains that the departure from school bears little or no relation to these costs; leaving school prematurely is mostly the result of genetic intelligence and family background. Whereas Bachman believes the

schools to be relatively equal and neutral in their effects, Levin claims they are biased; that they provide a better education to wealthier graduates. Levin appears to accept the fact that dropping out is both a cause and a symptom of deeper problems, but Bachman tends to discount any causal relationship based on the number of years spent in school.

Kaplan and Luck (1977) claim that dropping out is not the cause, but the symptom, of educational failure. They believe it is the final manifestation of a chronic problem which often has roots much earlier in the dropout's educational career. The dropout usually is already an academic failure prior to leaving school.

> Few high school students come all at once to a dramatic decision to leave school and strike out on their own. For most, the decision is long in the making and is rooted in years of unrewarding and unhappy school experience. The final act is the end of a process which, we suggest, has its beginnings in the elementary school years, at least for many (Kaplan & Luck, 1977, p. 47).

Bachman et al. (1972) believe that dropping out is a symptom which signifies a mismatch between certain individuals and the typical high school environment. In principle Bachman et al. (1972) believe the mismatch could be resolved by (a) changing the individuals so that they are better able to fit into the high school environment, (b) changing the high school environment, or (c) changing both. They think there is room for change on both sides.

Among the important elements in the mismatch between potential dropouts and the high school environment are individual limitations, in academic ability, past scholastic failure, and patterns of delinquent behavior. These are not problems that are likely to be resolved by persuading a young person to remain through the last year or two of

high school. But early intervention, in elementary school and perhaps much earlier, may overcome many of the problems which are deeply ingrained by the time an individual is ready to leave school prior to grade 12 completion (Bachman et al., 1972).

Even if the schools eventually reduced or eliminated early school failure and other problems which are presently associated with early school leaving, it is still worth asking whether our current approach to high school education is ideal. Is it clear that 12 or more years of uninterrupted schooling is necessary for all young people?

Bachman et al. (1972) report they have found both good and bad effects resulting from early school leaving. They have concluded that leaving school early is neither wholly "good" or "bad." They have found it to be a symptom, rather than a cause of new troubles or a cure for old ones. They are not encouraging young people to leave school early, but for some young people there must be alternatives available to the grade 12 diploma.

Summary

This review of the literature has focused upon the conceptualization and measurement of the concept of quality of school life. An attempt has been made to demonstrate that quality of school life might be an appropriate concept to relate to the early school leaving phenomenon, since no previous research has attempted to establish this relationship. In addition, the literature also focused upon the demographic variables and personal characteristics of early school leavers. Specifically, it has been established that family background factors, ability and school-related factors, and psychological factors have been found to be related to the reasons for early school leaving.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Described in this chapter is the method of selecting the schools and of identifying the early school leavers during the academic years 1980-81 and 1981-82. Methods of categorizing schools as "high," "medium," and "low" early school leaving schools are explained. The procedures for selecting the stay-in subjects are also presented. The development and selection of the interviewing schedules is explained in this chapter. The methodology employed in the interview portion of the study is also described.

A. SELECTION OF SCHOOLS AND IDENTIFICATION OF EARLY SCHOOL LEAVERS

In the register of schools, provided by the Department of Education, a sequential numerical code between 1 to n, where n is the last eligible name in the register, was assigned to each school. Those schools which did not contain any of the target grades, 8 to 12, were excluded during this coding process.

A computer program, RNDORD, from the Hewlett Packard library, which is supposed to order the numbers between 1 to n in a random order, was run. On the basis of this random list of numbers, schools were chosen beginning with the first number. As a school was identified, its enrollment in each of the target grades, 8-12, was recorded. A running total of enrollment by grade was kept. This was done so as to ensure approximate proportional representation, 15% of enrollment by grade. Once an approximate 15% enrollment in a specific grade was represented by the selected schools, the subsequent selections were made following the list of random numbers so that if a school added disproportionately to the grade that was already

over-represented it was skipped, and the school corresponding to the next numerical code was considered. According to this procedure 96 schools were identified. According to the Department of Education figures the 96 schools ranged from 46% to 0% in their early school leaving rates, with a mean early school leaving rate of 15%. By using 15% as the mean the schools were divided into high, medium, and low early school leaving classifications. The high early school leaving schools were comprised of schools which were reported to have early school leaving proportions from 46% to 20%, the medium schools ranged from 19% to 10%, while the low early school leaving schools had early leaving percentages of 9% to 0%. The majority of the schools fell into the low and medium classifications. Three schools from each classification were selected randomly from those schools which yielded at least ten early school leavers for the 1980/81 school term. It was also necessary to consult with the principals of the selected schools to ensure that the schools had at least ten early school leavers in the 1981/82 school term. In all, but one instance there was a sufficient number of early school leavers from both school terms. The one school which had only five 1981/82 early leavers was used in the study because there weren't any other low early leaving schools in the selected sample which produced a higher number of 1981/82 early leavers.

The final sample of 43 1980/81 early school leavers was comprised of those individuals who had left school early during that school year and who were available and willing to cooperate with the investigation of this study. The final sample of 46 1981/82 early school leavers was similarly made up of individuals who had left school early during the above school term and who were available and cooperative toward this

study. Table 1 illustrates the sample composition by school level classification and by subject status category.

The 81 stay-in subjects were students of similar age and academic performance to that of the early school leavers selected for this study. Initially the investigator attempted to match the stay-ins and early school leavers in terms of age, sex, home classroom, and academic performance. However, this procedure proved to be impossible. The principals of the schools involved attempted to match as closely as they could from the students that were available. The guiding criteria were to select from those students who were in school and who came closest to matching the characteristics of the early school leavers that were selected from their respective schools. In some instances it was not possible to match the early school leaver with a stay-in subject on all four criteria mentioned. All stay-in subjects selected were considered by the principal as potential early school leavers who were experiencing some academic difficulties in school as well as displaying similar attitudes towards school as the early school leavers demonstrated earlier in their school lives. Seventy-five percent of the stay-ins were matched for age, sex and grade with the early school leavers involved in this study. The remaining 25% of the stay-ins closely approximated the age, sex and grade of the early school leaving subjects.

B. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE SURVEY FORMS

Two survey forms entitled Student Survey Form (Form A and Form B) (Appendix A and B) were developed. Each of the forms consisted of two parts. Part A, which was common to both forms, consisted of 14 items. The first seven items required the respondent to provide the place of

Table 1

Sample Composition by School Level Classification of Rate of Early Leaving and by Subject Status Category for Two Years

School Level Classification	School	Status of Subjects: 80/81 ESL N	81/82 ESL N	Stay-in N	Total
High	1	5	5	10	20
	2	5	7	10	22
	3	5	5	10	20
Medium	1	5	4	10	19
	2	5	5	10	10
	3	5	4	0	9
Low	1	5	7	10	22
	2	5	5	10	20
	3	3	4	11	18
Total		43	46	81	170

birth of mother and father in terms of whether each parent was born in Canada or somewhere else; the level of education of mother and father; present job of mother and father; income of each parent; the number of older and younger brother and sisters; and the level of education of each, up to a maximum of six, of the older brothers/sisters in chronological order. The remaining seven items were forced-choice, "yes" or "no." These items attempted to solicit in a global way the reasons of the respondent for leaving school early, his/her current status, and whether or not he/she intended to return to school.

Part B of the Student Survey Forms consisted of 59 items. Twenty-five of these items pertained to the quality of school life and the remaining 34 items dealt with reasons for leaving early, the extent of support provided by others, and the nature of the decision to leave school. These items were Likert-type in format, with four descriptive choices consisting of "Strongly Agree," "Mostly Agree," "Mostly Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree."

The two sets of 25 items pertaining to the quality of school life in the two forms were different. The main source of these items was a scale developed by Williams and Batten (1981). However, the wording, including tense; the format of presentation; and the response alternatives were modified to suit the sample of school leavers. The Williams and Batten (1981) items were intended for pupils in school. Also, the scale descriptors "Definitely Agree" and "Definitely Disagree" were changed to "Strongly Agree" and "Strongly Disagree" respectively. The procedure used in selecting the 50 items from the 71 items Williams and Batten (1981) instrument was as follows: Each item statement was printed on an IBM card. This deck of 71 cards was given

individually to 12 faculty and graduate students in the College of Education for sorting. The sorters were also provided six cards which had typed on them the names of the six theoretical dimensions from the theoretical model of Williams and Batten (1981); namely, General Affect, Negative Affect, Status, Identity, Teachers, and Opportunity. They were also given a few blank cards. The task of the sorters was to sort the item statements into the six categories and to put aside the items which did not fit any of the six categories. They were then required to sort the left over cards into as many meaningful categories as they saw fit, and to label the categories they used. When the sorting task was finished, the sorters placed the labels on top of the statements, assembled the deck and returned it to the researchers. On the basis of the agreement of sorters, 10 most discriminating items for each of the five dimensions were selected. These dimensions were renamed as General Attitude, Status, Identity, Teacher-Pupil Relations, and Opportunity.

The ten statements in each dimension were randomly assigned to either form A or Form B so that there were five statements in each form. These 25 quality of school life items were interspersed with the 26 causes and reasons items. The last eight items in the assembled format of Part B of the instrument pertained to the support and the quality of the decision. The copies of the Student Survey Forms are given in Appendix A and B.

C. QUALITY OF SURVEY FORMS

In this section, the quality of the survey forms are discussed in terms of reliability, cluster and factor anylysis results. In performing the conventional reliability and other analyses, data from

each form were analyzed separately. It should be noted that the above analyses were performed by employing data obtained from a Saskatchewan province-wide study (Cipywnyk, Pawlovich, & Randhawa, 1983) which involved 341 subjects. This procedure was necessary in order to obtain an accurate measure of reliability and validity.

Reliability Analysis

Item-total correlations and squared multiple correlations for items in the five scales of the Quality of School Life in Survey Form A are reported in Table 2. The item-total correlation reported opposite each item in this table pertains to the linear correlation of the item score with that of the total scale score of the items in a specific scale of which the specific item is a part. Similarly, the squared multiple correlation reported for an item is the square of the multiple correlation of the item with the remaining items in a specific scale. While the item-total correlation indicates the extent to which the rankings of item and total are similar, the squared multiple correlation indicates the proportion of variance of an item in a scale that can be predicted by the scores on other items in that scale. These indices provide useful information to the user in terms of whether an item makes a worthwhile contribution to the internal consistency of a scale under consideration.

Along with the above statistics for each item within a scale, the analyses provided an estimate of the Cronbach Alpha for the scale had that item been omitted. As well, the coefficient of reliability for the existing scale, given in Table 2 was computed. The computer program used for these analyses was the Reliability subprogram from the SPSS update 7-9 (Hull & Nie, 1981).

Table 2

Conventional Reliability Results of Student Survey Form A

Scale, Item # in Survey Form and Description	Item-Total Statistics in 25 Item Form		Item-Total Statistics in 21 Item Form	
	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation
General Affect				
1. I felt happy at school.	.70	.57	.74	.57
11. I felt depressed at school.*	.62	.41	.58	.36
25. I felt lonely at school.*	.38	.19	omitted	
37. I felt great at school.	.75	.64	.76	.62
47. I felt confident at school.	.60	.48	.65	.48
Cronbach Alpha	.81		.84	
Identity				
3. I felt I was a reliable person at school.	.27	.08	.26	.08
13. At school other students rejected me as I was.*	.30	.10	.30	.09
27. I learnt a lot about myself at school	.31	.20	.38	.20
39. When I mixed with other people at school this helped me to understand myself.	.38	.23	.44	.23
49. At school I never knew the sorts of things I could do well.*	.03	.01	omitted	
Cronbach Alpha	.47		.56	
Opportunity				
5. In school I liked to do extra work in the subjects that interested me.	.26	.09	.29	.09
15. At school I did not talk to teachers about the way they marked my work.*	.19	.08	.26	.08
19. At school I learnt to see other people's point of view.	.16	.03	.16	.03

Table 2 continued...

Scale, Item # in Survey Form and Description	Item-Total Statistics in 25 Item Form		Item-Total Statistics in 21 Item Form	
	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation
29. At school I knew I could do enough well to be successful.	.25	.08	.17	.03
41. At school I learnt whatever I needed to know.	.10	.05	omitted	
Cronbach Alpha	.38		.40	
Teachers				
7. Teachers discouraged me from expressing opinions.*	.61	.46	.62	.46
17. My teachers treated all students equally.	.58	.36	.56	.34
21. Teachers took a personal interest in helping me with my schoolwork.	.48	.24	omitted	
31. My teachers treated me unfairly in class.*	.73	.58	.74	.57
43. Teachers I had were fair and just.	.69	.49	.68	.48
Cronbach Alpha	.82		.82	
Status				
9. At school people looked up to me.	.39	.19		
23. At school people lacked confidence in me.*	.52	.31		
33. At school other students ignored what I said.*	.54	.33		
35. People knew they could not depend on me at school.	.40	.17		
45. At school I was treated with respect.	.41	.17		
Cronbach Alpha	.69			

*These items were reflected before data analysis.

On the basis of consideration of these statistics, it was decided to omit one item from each of the General Affect (GA), Identity (I), Opportunity (O), and Teachers (T) scales in Form A. The item-total correlation, squared multiple correlation, and Cronbach Alpha coefficient of reliability for the reduced scales are also given in Table 2. For the GA, T, and S scales reliability coefficents were respectively .84, .82, and .69 which are quite satisfactory for instruments of this type and the homogeneous sample of respondents involved in the study. These values for I and O scales were respectively .56 and .40 which are lower than .60, an acceptable value for instruments designed for assessing complex attributes, which involve a small number of items, and which are administered to a somewhat homogeneous group of respondents. However, the reliability coefficient of .56 for I is marginally acceptable. Similar results on conventional reliability analyses for the Quality of School Life scales in Survey Form B are reported in Table 3. As can be seen in this table, GA and T scales had acceptable reliability coefficients of .75, and .83 respectively. The other scales, I, O, and S, had reliability coefficients of .47, .56, and .55 respectively. Only the I scale had an unacceptable reliability.

Cluster Analysis

The sets of 25 items comprising the Quality of School Life from each of the two survey forms were analyzed separately using the Cluster Analysis Program (University of Alberta, 1969). This program identifies homogeneous subsets with low intercorrelations among subsets from a pool of items. This procedure is based on the theory proposed by Loevinger, Gleser, and Dubois (1953). The program starts

Table 3

Conventional Reliability Results of Student Survey Form B

Scale, Item # in Survey Form and Description	Item-Total Statistics in 25 Item Form		Item-Total Statistics in 21 Item Form	
	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation
General Affect				
1. At School I felt good about things.	.56	.35	.52	.31
11. I felt restless at school.*	.60	.43	.60	.43
25. I felt bored at school.*	.58	.42	.58	.41
37. I got enjoyment from being at school	.45	.29	.49	.29
47. I got upset at school.*	.36	.17	omitted	
Cronbach Alpha	.74		.75	
Identity				
3. I acted in a responsible way at school.	.20	.05	.22	.05
13. At school I did not get to know myself better.*	.21	.09	.28	.09
27. I felt ashamed to be a student.*	.38	.17	.36	.14
39. I knew what my strengths and weaknesses were at school.	.17	.12	.26	.09
49. At school learning was hard for me.*	-.01	.04	omitted	
Cronbach Alpha	.36		.47	
Opportunity				
5. At school I did not learn how to find whatever information I needed.*	.22	.06	.22	.06
15. At school I did not learn what I needed to get by in life.*	.51	.30	.48	.27
19. At school I did not learn to get along with other people.*	.23	.07	.24	.07

Table 3 continued...

Scale, Item # in Survey Form and Description	Item-Total Statistics in 25 Item Form		Item-Total Statistics in 21 Item Form	
	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation	Item-Total Correlation	Square Multiple Correlation
29. At school I knew I could reach a satisfactory standard in my work.	.18	.06	omitted	
41. At school I learnt things that were useless to me.	.42	.26	.45	.26
Cronbach Alpha	.54		.56	
Teachers				
7. Teachers helped me to do my best.	.77	.63		
17. My teachers did not give me the marks I deserved.*	.51	.33		
21. Teachers were disinterested in what I did.*	.64	.43		
31. My teachers ignored any extra effort I made in my work.*	.63	.41		
43. Teachers were friendly to me in the classroom.	.57	.45		
Cronbach Alpha	.83			
Status				
9. At school people came to me for help.	.26	.08	.25	.07
23. At school I was thought of as a person who mattered.	.38	.16	.38	.16
33. I was known by a lot of people at school.	.24	.12	.31	.12
35. I knew that people at school did not think a lot of me.*	.38	.19	.40	.18
45. At school I was not trusted to work on my own.*	.10	.03	omitted	
Cronbach Alpha	.50		.55	

*These items were reflected before data analysis.

with a group of three most homogenous items and then considers other items, one at a time, until the criterion increase in the maximizing ratio in the KR-20 is not obtained. The maximizing ratio is the ratio of the sum of covariances to the sum of variances of the items selected to form a cluster.

For the Quality of School Life items in Survey Form A this procedure separated the items into four well separated clusters and left three of the items without cluster membership. The first cluster consisted of items 1, 37, and 47 (see Survey Form A), all of which were intended to measure General Affect and had a KR-20 value of .85. The second cluster consisted of all five of the Teacher scale items (7, 17, 21, 31, and 43) and had a KR-20 estimate of .82.

The third cluster consisted of all five items of the Status scale (9, 23, 33, 35, and 45), three of the Identity scale (3, 13, and 39), two of the General Affect scale (11, and 25), and one of the Opportunity scale (19). This rather amorphous cluster, with items from four scales, had a KR-20 estimate of .80. Since all five of the S scale items were included in the cluster it could be regarded as a Status dimension of the Quality of School Life. Since items from other three intended dimensions also clustered with these five S items, it might suggest the degree of similarily of response patterns to the items in this larger group of items. It is not uncommon to find measurement situations in social-psychological phenomena where items from different conceptual dimensions show substantial inter-item redundancies in spite of the theoretically expected low or no redundancy between two or more scales. This fact points out the analytic problem which may or may not be related to the conceptual

clarity underlying the development of a certain measurement framework.

The fourth cluster consisted of one item (27) from the I scale and two (29 and 41) from the O scale. The KR-20 estimate for this cluster was .41 which is low. In spite of the low internal consistency of the cluster it may suggest the existence of the Opportunity scale as part of the Quality of School Life (QSL) complex. How does one account for the two of the O items (5 and 15) and one of the I items (49) which were left unaccounted for in the cluster analysis procedure? It might again be due to the analytic artifact and not due to conceptual problems. In spite of the analytic problems alluded to in this section it is comforting to point out that a general support for the five-dimensional theoretical model of QSL is obtained through cluster analysis of Form A items. Four of the five diminsions have been distinctly differentiated; however, the third cluster subsumed three of the items of the fifth dimension. This cluster, due to its larger scope of interdimensional items, showed substantially larger correlations with cluster 1, 3, and 4 than with cluster 2, which consisted of all five of the T items. The cluster intercorrelation matrix is provided in Table 4.

The cluster analysis of the QSL items in Survey Form B also produced four clusters. These four clusters encompassed 23 items and two items were not included in any cluster.

The first cluster, with a KR-20 estimate of .81, consisted of three items (7,21,43) of T scale. Three items, two GA (11 and 25) and one O (15), defined the second cluster with a KR-20 value of .74.

The third cluster again was a large pot pouri cluster consisting of four O items (5, 19, 29, and 41), three GA (1, 37, and 47), three I

Table 4

Correlation Matrices of the Clusters for the Quality of School Life Items for Forms A and B[a]

Cluster	1	2	3	4
1	—	.29	.60	.45
2	.45	—	.25	.31
3	.71	.61	—	.36
4	.11	.11	.22	—

[a]Correlations above and below the diagonal are for clusters of items of Form A and Form B respectively.

(3, 13, and 27), two T (17 and 31), and two 3 (23 and 45). Since the largest number of items came from I, the conceptual QSL dimensional representations, this cluster might be regarded as the Identity grouping. As shown above, it is rather generously represented by the items from the other four dimensions as well. Hence, it may not be considered as a pure cluster but as one which is highly diffused. The KR-20 estimate of this cluster was .78.

The fourth cluster was defined by three items from the S dimension of the QSL model. It had a KR-20 value of .44.

Two items (39 and 49) without any cluster membership were from the I dimension. It may be because of the cluster procedure's minimum requirement of starting with a cluster of three items that these items were not put in a cluster.

These data again generally support the five dimensional model of QSL. The intercorrelations among the four clusters are provided in Table 4. As can be seen in this table, clusters 1, 2, and 4 were relatively independent, low intercorrelations, of each other. Only cluster 3, which was composed of items from all of the five QSL dimensions, was such that it had larger than expected correlations with clusters 1 and 2.

In summary, the results of the separate cluster analysis for QSL items in Forms A and B generally demonstrate the existence of five somewhat independent conceptual dimensions.

Factor Analysis

Item responses of the 25 items of the Quality of School Life from each form, after adjusting for polarity, were submitted separately to the iterative principal factor procedure (Nie, Hull, Jenkins,

Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). This procedure was followed by a varimax rotation. The first time these subprograms were run for the data of each form, the number of factors were determined on the basis of the eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater. This solution and the plots of the eigenvalues of the principal components were examined. On the basis of these examinations, it was decided that a five factor solution in each case was the most parsimonious.

Form A. The varimax factor loadings and communalities of the items of Form A are reported in Table 5. The first factor is defined by the five items of the Teacher scale of the conceptual QSL model. Hence, this factor is a relatively pure Teacher Factor which accounts for approxiamtely 51% of the common variance.

The second factor is loaded by the five items of the Status scale. It also has significant loadings on an item of I scale and two items of G scale. Nevertheless, on the basis of numerosity, S scale items and the size of the loadings, this factor might be regarded as the Status Factor. This factor accounts for about 21% of the variance.

The third factor, highly loaded by four of the five items of the General Affect scale, is clearly an indication of General Affect. This factor accounts for approximately 13% of the common variance.

The fourth factor seems to be defined by the high loadings of two of the Identity scale items and may be regarded as an indication of the existence of this scale. The amount of variance accounted for by this factor is about 8% of the common variance encompased by the five factors.

The fifth factor, mostly a residual factor, is loaded significantly by one each of Opportunity (15) and Identity (3) items.

Table 5

Varimax Factor Loadings for Form A of the Quality of School Life (n=185)

	Items	Factors					h^2
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1.	I felt happy at school.	23	20	78	29	06	79
2.	I felt I was a reliable person at school.	-04	20	15	18	50	35
3.	At school I liked to do extra work in the subjects that interested me.	-06	-03	37	13	17	19
4.	Teachers discouraged me from expressing my opinions.	73	13	-02	-09	-02	57
5.	At school people looked up to me.	-13	43	18	23	17	31
6.	I felt depressed at school.	21	41	52	09	-06	49
7.	At school other students rejected me as I was.	14	62	21	16	09	48
8.	At school I did not talk to teachers about the way they marked my work.	-01	06	35	-01	16	16
9.	My teachers treated all students equally.	63	-04	04	08	03	41
10.	At school I learnt to see other people's point of view.	10	17	14	34	06	18
11.	Teachers took a personal interest in helping me with my schoolwork.	53	-02	10	30	07	39
12.	At school people lacked confidence in me.	02	61	-09	-05	27	45
13.	I felt lonely at school.	02	63	28	00	-18	50
14.	I learnt a lot about myself at school.	15	02	13	61	00	41
15.	At school I knew I could do well enough to be successful.	14	-07	15	08	48	29
16.	My teachers treated me unfairly in class.	82	22	03	-02	-09	73
17.	At school other students ignored what I said.	15	67	05	19	-06	52
18.	People knew they could not depend on me at school.	05	48	24	-19	29	41
19.	I felt great at school.	17	27	68	30	14	67
20.	When I mixed with other people at school this helped me to understand myself.	00	12	25	63	07	48
21.	At school I learnt whatever I needed to know.	22	18	20	15	09	15
22.	Teachers I had were fair and just.	75	02	14	11	17	62
23.	At school I was treated with respect.	38	43	06	26	29	49
24.	I felt confident at school.	14	33	47	24	40	58
25.	At school I never knew the sorts of things I could do well.	01	07	08	-15	22	08
	Total Variance	549	220	143	084	072	1068

It seems that the Opportunity scale was generally obliterated due to the redundancies of the items of other scales with those of this scale. The low Cronbach alpha for the items of this scale, reported earlier in Table 2, may in part account for the state of affairs obtained here.

Similar to the above analysis done for the 25 items of the Quality of School Life items in Form A, it was repeated with 21 items. The four items, which were identified as non-contributing to the internal consistency of their respective scales in Table 2, were not included in this factor analysis. The varimax loadings and communalities for the 21 item factor analysis are reported in Table 6.

It can be seen in Table 6 that Factor I is clearly a Teacher factor defined by the significant loadings of all four of the items of the T scale in the QSL model. This factor accounted for approximately 51% of the common variance.

The second factor is almost a pure Status factor defined by all five of the S items. It also is loaded by one of the I items. This factor accounted for about 21% of the common variance.

The third factor is defined primarily by the substantial loadings of all four of the General Affect items. It accounted for approximately 13% of the common variance.

The fourth factor appears to be the Identity factor because it has substantial loadings of two of the I scale items. It also has a marginal loading (.41) for one of the Opportunity scale items. The amount of common variance accounted for by this factor is about 8%.The fifth factor, primarily residual, could be regarded as the Opportunity factor. This is because it has been marginally defined by one of the items of O scale and it has secondary loadings of two other items of O

Table 6

Varimax Factor Loadings and Communalities of the 21 Items of the Quality of School Life Form A (n=185)

	Items	Factors					h^2
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1.	I felt happy at school.	20	16	79	32	06	79
2.	I felt I was a reliable person at school.	-06	25	13	13	54	40
3.	At school I liked to do extra work in the subjects that interested me.	-07	-04	34	14	20	18
4.	Teachers discouraged me from expressing my opinions.	74	11	01	-02	-06	57
5.	At school people looked at me.	-13	42	19	20	19	30
6.	I felt depressed at school.	19	36	55	11	-09	49
7.	At school other students rejected me as I was.	11	60	19	22	01	45
8.	At school I did not talk to teachers about the way they marked my work.	-01	03	34	00	21	16
9.	My teachers treated all students equally.	61	-02	04	10	04	39
10.	At school I learnt to see other people's point of view.	10	18	14	41	04	23
11.	At school people lacked confidence in me.	02	70	-04	-04	13	51
12.	I learnt a lot about myself at school.	10	03	13	59	04	37
13.	At school I knew I could do well enough to be successful.	11	00	16	05	42	21
14.	My teachers treated me unfairly in class.	83	18	06	03	-07	73
15.	At school other students ignored what I said.	14	65	12	18	-11	50
16.	People knew they could not depend on me at school.	07	46	24	-12	25	35
17.	I felt great at school.	14	23	70	30	15	67
18.	When I mixed with other people at school this helped me to understand myself.	-02	09	20	70	13	56
19.	Teachers I had were fair and just.	76	01	14	11	24	66
20.	At school I was treated with respect.	37	44	07	25	30	49
21.	I felt confident at school.	12	35	53	18	37	59
	Total Variance	496	201	125	075	065	962

scale. This somewhat weak and residual factor, Opportunity, accounted for approximately 7% of the common variance.

It appears from the above factor analysis results that the five conceptual dimensions in the Quality of School Life construct are justified. However, in Form A the Opportunity dimension is somewhat weak and it may be wise to reconsider the items in this scale in any future use of this form. The other four dimensions have a reasonable degree of internal consistency and tend to be discriminated one from the other.

Form B. The varimax loadings and communalities for the 25 QSL items in Survey Form B are included in Table 7.

The first factor, Teacher-Pupil Relations, was defined primarily by four of the five T scale items. It accounted for approximately 58% of the common variance.

The second factor, which had substantial loadings for four of the GA scale items and for one of O scale items, appeared to be a General Affect factor. It accounted for approximately 15% of the common variance.

The third factor appeared to have reliable loadings for three O, three T, one GA, and one I items. If one imposes the simple structure and primary criteria, it becomes apparent that this factor could be regarded as the Opportunity factor. As pointed out earlier in the context of Form A, this dimension is somewhat diffuse and ambiguous and the items used in this scale ought to be re-evaluated in order to clearly measure this dimension of QSL. The Opportunity factor accounted for approximately 11% of the common variance.

The fourth factor was loaded by three of the S scale items and one

Table 7

Varimax Factor Loadings for Form B of the Quality of School Life (n=156)

	Items	Factors					h^2
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1.	At school I felt good about things.	40	44	14	15	13	41
2.	I acted in a responsible way at school.	14	26	21	-04	42	31
3.	At school I did not learn how to find whatever information I needed.	15	13	33	-10	16	19
4.	Teachers helped me to do my best.	81	15	31	-04	26	84
5.	At school people came to me for help.	13	23	-11	23	14	16
6.	I felt restless at school.	17	61	13	06	22	47
7.	At school I did not get to know myself better.	08	33	02	15	28	22
8.	At school I did not learn what I needed to get by in life.	08	49	42	06	12	44
9.	My teachers did not give me the marks I deserved.	30	01	55	-07	16	43
10.	At school I did not learn to get along with other people.	11	14	21	54	22	42
11.	Teachers were disinterested in what I did.	47	28	47	07	13	54
12.	At school I was thought of as a person who mattered.	48	14	20	48	-02	52
13.	I felt bored at school.	07	82	18	-07	14	74
14.	I felt ashamed to be a student.	10	12	14	25	41	28
15.	At school I knew I could reach a satisfactory standard in my work.	22	17	10	14	14	13
16.	My teachers ignored any extra effort I made in my work.	49	11	49	-07	07	51
17.	I was known by a lot of people at school.	-08	-09	-16	59	-02	38
18.	I knew that people at school did not think a lot of me.	06	14	18	62	14	46
19.	I got enjoyment from being at school.	33	51	01	25	-13	45
20.	I knew what my strengths and weaknesses were at school.	09	04	-16	18	41	24
21.	At school I learnt things that were useless to me.	17	31	51	06	-01	39
22.	Teachers were friendly to me in the classroom.	67	17	14	09	19	54
23.	At school I was not trusted to work on my own.	14	08	31	-02	58	46
24.	I got upset at school.	12	22	55	18	15	42
25.	At school learning was hard for me.	02	-04	36	09	03	14
	Total Variance	586	151	113	081	075	1005

of the O scale items. It could be interpreted as the Status factor. This factor accounted for about 8% of the common variance.

The fifth factor was defined by four of the I scale items and one of the S scale items. It was interpreted as the Identity factor. This factor accounted for approximately 7% of the common variance.

These five factors seem to justify the five dimensions of the QSL items in Survey Form B. It remains to be seen how the 21 item factor analysis compares with this 25 item factor analysis. Therefore, the varimax loadings and communalities are included in Table 8 and the results are very briefly discussed.

As can be seen from the factor loadings reported in Table 8, five clearly distinguished factors emerged in this reduced set of items of Form B. These factors are respectively Teacher-Pupil Relations, General Affect, Status, Opportunity, and Identity. These factors respectively accounted for approximately 58%, 17%, 12%, 7%, and 6% of the common variance.

Hence, the five dimensional construct of the Quality of School Life seems to have been justified on the basis of these results. It is always desirable, however, to reconsider the appropriateness of the items when these scales are considered for use with another group of subjects.

D. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE PROCEDURES

Two parallel forms of quality of school life survey forms were constructed, due to the relatively small sample size, it was deemed feasible to employ only one of the two survey forms. Form A was selected as the instrument to be used in the empirical portion of this study. Furthermore, only Part B was administered to the subjects

Table 8

Varimax Factor Loadings and Communalities of the 21 Items of Quality of School Life Form B (n=156)

	Items	Factors					h^2
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1.	At school I felt good about things.	35	53	10	06	15	44
2.	I acted in a responsible way at school.	25	22	-03	21	23	21
3.	At school I did not learn how to find whatever information I needed.	31	09	-09	19	12	16
4.	Teachers helped me to do my best.	84	28	07	02	10	80
5.	At school people came to me for help.	00	30	23	02	09	15
6.	I felt restless at school.	18	55	-01	26	29	49
7.	At school I did not get to know myself better.	07	28	10	16	34	24
8.	At school I did not know what I needed to get by in life.	22	26	08	62	09	52
9.	My teachers did not give me the marks I deserved.	56	-08	-03	25	13	40
10.	At school I did not learn to get along with other people.	16	11	56	17	25	45
11.	Teachers were disinterested in what I did.	62	22	13	28	11	55
12.	At school I was thought of as a person who mattered.	40	23	53	05	-01	50
13.	I felt bored at school.	09	63	-12	52	17	72
14.	I felt ashamed to be a student.	17	07	16	05	59	41
15.	My teachers ignored any extra effort I made in my work.	68	05	00	22	05	52
16.	I was known by a lot of people at school.	-22	01	58	-15	06	42
17.	I knew that people at school did not think a lot of me.	05	09	57	11	26	42
18.	I got enjoyment from being at school.	18	54	23	12	-03	39
19.	I knew what my strengths and weakneses were at school.	02	06	14	-05	35	15
20.	At school I learnt things that were useless to me.	37	12	14	55	-11	49
21.	Teachers were friendly to me in the classroom.	61	35	13	-09	08	53
	Total Variance	496	202	125	075	065	963

because this part pertained to quality of school life and reasons for leaving school. Part A was not administered because similar demographic data were obtained through interview schedules employed in the interview portion of this study.

Each early school leaver was administered the Students Survey Form (Form A) (Appendix A), while each stay-in was administered the Students in School Survey Form (Form A) (Appendix C). The administration of the instruments was conducted in a school or school board office in most instances; four subjects completed the survey form at their home while one subject completed the form in a restaurant. All forms were individually administered by one of two investigators, during the months of March, April and May 1982. The subjects required approximately 20 minutes to complete the instrument.

The early school leavers' responses to the Students Survey Form (Form A) and the stay-ins' responses to Students in School Survey Form (Form A) were coded and entered into the computer for analysis.

E. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE ANALYSIS

The QSL data on five scales were analyzed using multivariate (MANOVA) and univariate (ANOVA) analysis of variance involving a fixed two factor crossed design. The first factor, Status, consisted of 80/81 early school leavers, 81/82 early school leavers, and stay-ins. The second factor, Level, consisted of three levels of intensity of early school leaving rates; high, medium and low. The level of significance for testing the main effects and interaction was .05. If the MANOVA effect or interaction was found to be significant, the ANOVA results were taken as reliable and interpreted accordingly. Otherwise the ANOVA results were not considered worthy of interpretation.

Data on reasons and causes were analyzed in such a way that means and standard deviations of each item within a subset of items of a category were computed and reported in order of highest to lowest mean of items.

F. INTERVIEWING METHODOLOGY

The interview portion of this study involved interviewing 70 early school leavers from six of the nine schools involved in the empirical section of the study. The interview data obtained from the six schools were considered to be sufficient to gain insight into the early school leaving phenomenon. In addition to the early school leavers, 64 teachers and/or principals, 60 parents and 61 stay-ins were interviewed.

Sample

Of the 70 early school leavers, 35 had left school during the 1980/81 term while 35 had left school during the 1981/82 school term. Initially the investigators attempted to select candidates randomly for interviewing; however, it became necessary to interview those early school leavers that were available and willing to be interviewed. It was also necessary to select schools which had identified at least 15 early school leavers from each of the school years involved in order to be reasonably sure that a minimum of five early school leavers per school could be identified and interviewed.

The 64 teachers and/or principals selected for the study were those individuals which the principal indicated had a good knowledge of an early school leaver that was interviewed. The 60 parents interviewed were those parents of the early school leavers which agreed to be interviewed; only in one instance were both parents of an early school

leaver interviewed.

Finally, 61 stay-ins of similar age and academic performance to that of the early school leavers interviewed earlier were chosen to comprise the stay-ins sample. Initially the investigator attempted to match the stay-ins and early school leavers in terms of age, sex, home classroom, and academic performance. However, this procedure proved to be impossible. The principals of the schools involved attempted to match as closely as they could from the students that were available. The guiding criteria were to select those students who were in school that came closest to matching the characteristics of the early school leavers. In some instances it was not possible to match the early school leaver with a stay-in subject on all four criteria mentioned. All the stay-in subjects were considered by the principal as potential early school leavers who were experiencing some academic difficulties in school as well as displaying similar attitudes towards school as the early school leavers demonstrated earlier in their school lives. Seventy-five percent of the stay-ins were of the same age, sex and grade as the early school leavers involved in this study.

G. INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

The "Student Interview Schedule" (Appendix D) was utilized when interviewing early school leavers. The "Principals and Teachers Interview Schedule" (Appendix E) was used with principals and teachers in this study. The "Parents Interview Schedule" (Appendix F) was employed when interviewing parents. The "Stay-ins Interview Schedule" (Appendix G) served as the guide to questions used in interviewing the stay-ins. The above schedules were designed by this investigator by using questions from schedules that were employed in earlier studies

(Archer, 1978; Reich & Young, 1975). Minor revisions to some of the schedules were made in order to make the schedules consistent with the questions posed in this study.

H. INTERVIEWING PROCEDURES

All early school leavers were interviewed in person by one of two trained interviewers, who also conducted the interviews with school personnel and parents. Each early school leaver interview took approximately one hour to complete. These interviews were conducted at a school or school board office for all but five of the individuals. Four early school leavers were interviewed in their homes while one was interviwed in a restaurant.

The principals and teachers were also interviewed in person at the schools. Each interview took about 15 - 20 minutes.

The parents were interviewed via telephone. A parent interview usually took approximately 15 minutes to complete. One or both parents of the early school leavers involved in this study were telephoned, however, in ten cases it was not possible to contact either of the parents.

The interviews were recorded on paper; the interviewers wrote down verbatim the comments made by the interviewees. The interviewers conducted several interviews together in order to assure consistency in interviewing techniques. Several interviews were tape recorded and were played to a third party in order to determine whether the interviews were conducted in similar fashion. All of the above procedures did indicate that both interviewers conducted the questioning and recording of comments in a similar manner. The written data obtained by the interviewers were organized, tabulated, and

reported in descriptive and summative form. While three individuals performed the above procedures independently, the results produced were consistently similar in terms of frequency counts, interpretation of comments, and the conclusions reached from the interpretations.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the results of responses of the subjects on the quality of school life and the reasons and issues for leaving school early are reported and discussed. In addition the interview data are summarized and explained.

A. QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE (QSL) RESULTS

The results of the QSL are presented in this section. Five dimensions of QSL were measured and related to the status level factors of early school leaving. The results of multivariate (MANOVA) and univariate (ANOVA) analysis of variance of the five scales were derived from the 25 quality of school life items. It should be noted that the MANOVA results derived from the 21 quality of school life items produced similar results as did the 25 items.

Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there will be no significant differences in the perception of quality of school life for students from high, medium and low early school leaving schools. Means of the five scales of QSL for Form A on the three level classifications are given in Table 9. The multivariate main effect on level was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

Since this multivariate F-ratio did not reach a .05 level of significance, the univariate effect of level on each scale was not considered reliable. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was accepted, meaning that students from high, medium and low early school leaving schools did not differ in their perceptions of the quality of school life. These results indicated that in terms of quality of school life as perceived by students, there were no differences in the profile of

means for students from high, medium and low early school leaving schools.

Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no significant differences in perception of the quality of school life among students that left prior to grade 12 completion and their age-mate stay-ins within the same schools.

Means of the five scales of the QSL for Form A on the early school leavers and stay-ins are reported in Table 9. The multivariate main effects on Status was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Because of this fact the univariate effects were considered not reliable even if a level of significance was attained by any of the scales. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was accepted, indicating that early school leavers when compared to stay-ins did not differ in their perceptions of quality of school life.

Null Hypothesis 3 stated there will be no significant differences in perceived quality of school life between students who had left prior to grade 12 completion for less than six months as compared to students who had left school prematurely for more than eight months.

Means of the five QSL scales on the two classifications of early school leavers are tabulated in Table 9. As previously reported multivariate main effects on Status was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was accepted, meaning that less than six-month leavers do not differ from more than eight-month leavers in their perception of quality of school life. These results suggested that different durations of time out of school by early school leavers did not result in different perceptions of their quality of school life.

Table 9

Means of Five Scales for the 25 Items of the Quality of School Life Form A for Three Status Categories and Three Level Classifications

	Status			Level		
Scale	80/81	81/82	Stay-in	High	Med	Low
N=43	N=46	N=81	N=62	N=48	N=60	
1. General Affect	12.3	12.9	12.7	12.5	12.6	12.8
2. Identity	13.4	13.9	13.4	13.8	13.4	13.6
3. Opportunity	11.9	12.4	13.1	12.1	12.8	12.5
4. Teacher-Pupil Relations	11.8	13.0	12.5	12.2	13.0	12.3
5. Status	14.2	14.3	14.0	13.4	14.6	14.4

B. REASONS AND CAUSES FOR LEAVING SCHOOL EARLY RESULTS

The early school leavers in this study were asked to respond to the items in Part B of the Student Survey Form. Thirty-four of the items dealt with reasons and causes, extent of support provided by others, and the nature of the decision to leave school. These items were Likert-type in format with four descriptive choices consisting of "Stongly Agree" (4), "Mostly Agree" (3), "Mostly Disagree" (2), and "Strongly Disagree" (1). The descriptive choices were assigned a number value from four to one as indicated by the number in the brackets above. Means and Standard Deviations were calculated for each item in order to rank order the intensity of the responses for each item.

Summary statistics of items pertaining to personal factors for leaving school are given in Table 10. Of these 10 items, five with the highest means pertain to the respondents wanting more freedom, having personal problems (worries), having home responsibilities, not getting along at home and wanting to travel.

In Table 11 are provided the summary results of items pertaining to school related causes of leaving school early. As can be seen five of the items with the highest means dealt with (1) learning not relevant to choice of career, (2) dissatisfaction with the school program, (3) dissatisfaction with the teachers and the teaching, (4) dislike for school rules and regulations, (5) experiencing school difficulties. The item with the lowest mean pertained to "experiencing reading difficulty."

Summary statistics of responses to items dealing with economic causes for leaving school early are reported in Table 12. It can be

Table 10

Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items on Personal Causes for Leaving School Early

Personal Factors	80/81 (N=43) Mean	80/81 (N=43) S.D.	81/82 (N=46) Mean	81/82 (N=46) S.D.	Total (N=89) Mean	Total (N=89) S.D.
1. I quit school because I wanted more freedom.	2.51	1.16	2.54	1.00	2.53	1.08
2. Personal problems (worries) the reason for quitting school.	2.26	1.05	2.28	1.06	2.27	1.05
3. I left school because of home responsibilites.	1.86	0.89	1.67	0.79	1.76	0.84
4. I wasn't getting along at home so I quit school.	1.81	0.88	1.64	0.83	1.73	0.85
5. I left school because I wanted to travel.	1.74	0.76	1.63	0.80	1.68	0.78
6. I left school because of personal illness.	1.45	0.68	1.51	0.76	1.49	0.72
7. I quit school because my friends had left.	1.44	0.70	1.50	0.69	1.47	0.69
8. I left school to get married.	1.25	0.74	1.41	0.80	1.35	0.83
9. I had to leave school because I had left home.	1.26	0.62	1.50	0.78	1.38	0.72
10. Illness in my family made me leave school.	1.28	0.63	1.24	0.43	1.26	0.53

Table 11

Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items on School-Related Causes for Leaving School Early

School-Related Factors	80/81 (N=43) Mean	S.D.	81/82 (N=46) Mean	S.D.	Total (N=89) Mean	S.D.
1. I left school because what I was learning was not relevant to my choice of career.	2.46	1.10	2.39	1.14	2.42	1.12
2. My dissatisfaction with the school program was the reason for leaving.	2.42	1.12	2.37	1.08	2.39	1.09
3. I was dissatisfied with and the teachers and the teaching so I quit.	2.39	1.18	2.26	1.16	2.33	1.17
4. I did not like the school rules and regulations, so I left.	2.19	1.16	2.28	1.18	2.24	1.17
5. Since I was experiencing academic difficulties so I left school.	2.30	1.08	2.02	1.02	2.16	1.05
6. Since my school attendance was poor so I was forced to leave.	2.00	1.00	2.26	1.04	2.13	1.03
7. I did not get along with the staff so I quit school.	2.03	0.91	2.20	1.06	2.12	0.99
8. I left school because I was suspended or expelled.	1.39	0.80	1.45	0.91	1.43	0.89
9. Since I had a reading difficulty I quit school.	1.34	0.61	1.50	0.78	1.43	0.71

Table 12

Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items on Economic Causes for Leaving School Early

	Economic Factors	80/81 (N=43) Mean	80/81 (N=43) S.D.	81/82 (N=46) Mean	81/82 (N=46) S.D.	Total (N=89) Mean	Total (N=89) S.D.
1.	I left school because I felt I was wasting my time.	2.58	1.12	2.67	1.17	2.62	1.14
2.	I wanted to look for a job and go to work so I left school.	2.26	1.14	2.36	1.11	2.31	1.11
3.	My desire for more spending money made me leave school.	2.14	1.06	2.15	1.03	2.15	1.04
4.	I quit school to support myself.	2.09	1.06	2.00	1.05	2.04	1.05
5.	Got a job offer so I quit school.	1.81	0.98	1.63	0.83	1.72	0.90
6.	I left school to assist in a family business.	1.46	0.67	1.52	0.79	1.52	0.74
7.	I left school to earn money my family needed.	1.35	0.65	1.33	0.60	1.34	0.62

seen that the three items with the highest mean were the following: (1) I left school because I felt I was wasting my time, (2) I wanted to look for a job and go to work so I left school, (3) My desire for more spending money made me leave school. The range of means for these items was 2.15 to 2.62. The remaining four items had a mean value of 2.04 or less.

Summary statistics of responses of items pertaining to the extent of support provided by others in the decision to leave school early are provided in Table 13. It can be seen that items with the highest means were (1) the principal was not helpful when I raised the question of leaving and (2) the guidance counsellor was helpful when I raised the question of leaving school. The remaining three items had a mean value of 2.44 or less, meaning that less than 50% of the respondents agreed with these item statements. Upon examinaing the above results, it may be interpreted that more than 50% of the respondents indicated the principal was not helpful, while the counsellor was somewhat more helpful than the principal when the early leavers raised the question of leaving school. Furthermore, less than half of the respondents perceived their mother and friends as being supportive of the early leaver's decision to leave school. For the majority of the early school leavers the decision to quit school would not have been different even if a change in the timetable had been possible. This statement is supported by the statistics provided for item 1 in Table 14. Furthermore, most of the early school leavers retrospectively were happy about the decision to leave school, this item had a mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 1.05. The mean of the item "I thought for a long time before I left school" was 2.70 with a standard deviation of 1.06. This suggests that most of the early school leavers

Table 13

Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Items Pertaining to the Extent of Support Provided by Others

	80/81 (N=43)		81/82 (N=46)		Total (N=89)	
Support Provided	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1. The principal was not helpful when I raised the question of leaving.	2.77	1.12	2.36	1.14	2.56	1.13
2. The guidance counsellor was helpful when I raised the question of leaving school.	2.41	1.98	2.69	1.29	2.51	1.97
3. My father did not support my decision about leaving school.	2.59	1.10	2.30	1.04	2.44	1.05
4. My mother supported my decision about leaving school.	2.23	1.13	2.27	0.97	2.26	1.04
5. My friends supported my decision about leaving school.	2.23	0.87	2.13	0.87	2.18	0.86

Table 14

Mean and Standard Deviation of Items Pertaining to the Nature of the Decision to Leave School

	80/81 (N=43)		81/82 (N=46)		Total (N=89)	
Nature of Decision	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1. I would not have stayed in school even if my timetable had been changed.	2.81	1.10	2.73	1.09	2.79	1.10
2. I am happy that I left school.	2.67	1.02	2.80	1.15	2.70	1.05
3. I thought for a long time before I left school.	2.72	1.10	2.69	1.04	2.70	1.06

did not act impulsively when deciding to quit school.

C. INTERVIEW RESULTS

The information obtained from interviewing 70 early school leavers, 61 stay-ins, 64 teachers/principals and 60 parents is presented in this section. Due to the overwhelming number of tables pertaining to interview data, only the most pertinent tables are present in the text. The remaining tables are available in Appendix H. For purposes of reporting and writing convenience the tables included in Appendix H are prefaced with the letter H.

As can be seen the results in Table 15 indicate that the early school leaver sample was composed of 42 (60%) males and 28 (40%) females ranging in age from 15 to 20 years; the majority being at the ages of 17 (34.3%), 16 (24.3%) and 18 (22.9%) years. Most of the early school leavers left school when they were in grade 11 (30)(42.9%) or grade 10 (26) (37.1%).

The months during which the early school leavers left school are reported in Table H1. October (20%) and February (15.7%) were the most popular months for leaving school.

The occupational status of early school leavers' parents is reported in Table H2. The majority of early school leavers' parents were employed in occupations of the unskilled (26.5%) and skilled (22.1%) labor categories.

Table H3 indicates that the educational levels completed by parents was predominantly at the less than grade 8 level (30%); however, 17.9% of the parents completed grade 10 and 17.1% completed grade 12.

Table 15

Age Distribution, Sex, and Grade of Early School Leavers for Two Years from Six Schools

	Age						Sex		Grade			
Year	15	16	17	18	19	20	M	F	9	10	11	12
1980-81	2	13	8	7	2	3	20	15	3	15	13	4
1981-82	3	4	16	9	3	0	22	13	4	11	17	3
Total	5	17	24	16	5	3	42	28	7	26	30	7
Percent	7.1	24.3	34.3	22.9	7.1	4.3	60.0	40.0	10.0	37.1	42.9	10.0

As shown in Table H4 the typical early school leaver in this sample has a mean of 3.75 siblings. In regard to family position almost half (47.1%) of the early school leavers were the youngest in their family; 32.9% were the middle child and 18.6% were the oldest in the family. Thirty-six (51.4%) early school leavers had at least one sibling precede them in leaving school early. Thirty-nine (55.7%) of the early school leavers still had siblings attending school.

Results in Table H5 show that 97.1% of the early school leavers reported that English was the dominant language spoken in their home while 2.9% reported French as the main language.

Upon examination of Table H6 it can be seen that 95.7% of the early school leavers were Canadian born and 92.1% of the parents were Canadian born as well. Only 4.2% of the early school leavers were not born in Canada while 7.9% of the parents were born outside of Canada.

It is revealed in Table H7 that the number of schools attended by early school leavers in this study ranged from one to nine. Thirty-one (44.3%) early school leavers attended four schools or more during their school attending period.

Information reported in Table H8 indicates that 54.3% of the early school leavers in this study had failed a complete grade prior to leaving school. The major reasons given by the early school leavers for failing a grade were "neglect of school work," "problems getting along with teachers," "subjects too difficult," and "problems adjusting from one school to the next." Table H9 indicates that grade seven was the grade reported as most frequently failed (12.9%) by the early school leavers with grades 10 (11.4%) and 9 (11.4%) following close behind.

With reference to Table H10 it can be seen that 64.3% of the early school leavers reported their general satisfaction with school as good, and 31.4% as borderline. Only 4.3% of the individuals reported poor general satisfaction. About 57.1% of the early school leavers reported they were getting along satisfactorily with the teachers while 34.3% reported their relationship with teachers as borderline. Five (7.1%) said they were getting along poorly with the teachers and one person was undecided in regard to his/her relationship with teachers. Thirty percent of the early school leavers reported they were getting along satisfactorily with the principal and/or vice principal of their school, ten (14.3%) said their relationship was borderline, and 15 (21.4%) claimed that it was poor. Twenty-three (32.9%) of the early school leavers said they had little involvement with the principal and/or vice principal. Table H10 reveals that 11.4% of the early school leavers reported their school performance as being good, while 38.6% perceived it as being borderline, and thirty-two (45.7%) felt it was poor. Fifty-eight (82.9%) of the early school leavers thought they were getting along satisfactorily with their peers while five (7.1%) said their peer relationships were borderline. Seven (10%) reported their relationships with peers as poor.

The teacher qualities that early school leavers reported they liked in teachers are summarized in Table H11. Thirty-eight (34.9%) of the responses being "they liked the teacher to be understanding and caring." Sixteen (14.7%) indicated early school leavers liked teachers who "assisted students when required." Fifteen (13.8%) of the responses stated they liked teachers "who took time to talk to you," while 13 (11.9%) of the responses revealed that early school leavers

liked teachers to be "friendly and personable."

Table H12 indicates that 81.4% of the early school leavers had experienced teachers they disliked. The teacher qualities disliked the most were "not showing any caring towards students," "negative attitudes towards students," "never showing interest in students," and "hassling you but not helping students." Table H12 also indicates that 30 (42.9%) early school leavers talked to teachers regarding personal concerns, while 40 (57.1%) did not. Of the 40 who did not talk to teachers, 57.5% said they would have liked to have confided in their teachers, while 42.5% said they did not want to talk to teachers regarding personal concerns even if they had the opportunity.

Results in table H13 indicate that 100% of the students had taken some subjects they liked. The major reasons given for liking certain subjects were "liked the content of the subject matter and found it interesting," "liked the fun activities in the classes," they "were good at them," and "liked the teachers that taught them." Table H13 also shows that 82.9% of the early school leavers had taken subjects they disliked, while only 17.1% said they had not experienced any subjects they disliked. The main reasons given for disliking some subjects were: "problems doing the work," "problems with teachers," and "saw no relevance and no practicality in taking the subject."

With reference to Table H14 it can be seen that 64.3% of the early school leavers said they had problems doing the school work. The most popular method of handling problems encountered in school was to "ignore them, to do nothing and not to ask for help." The second most frequently reported method was "to ask and receive help from the teachers," while the third was to "ask but not receive help from the

teachers."

As shown in Table H15, 80% of the early school leavers did spend out of school time with classmates while 20% said they did not spend time with classmates. The most common activities of early school leavers spending time together were "drinking alcohol and/or taking drugs," "going for coffee," "driving around," "partying," and "engaging in sports activities."

Upon examination of Table H16 it is found that 48.6% of the early school leavers did have a conversational kind of relationship with the principal and/or vice principal while 51.4% reported they did not talk with them. The major reasons given for not talking with the principal and/or the vice principal were: "didn't want to bother him/her," "didn't want him/her involved," and "not my kind of person." Of the early school leavers reporting that they had been able to talk with the principal and/or the vice principal the major topics of conversation had to do with the early school leavers "lack of school attendance" and the early school leavers "school progress" or for "being in some trouble in school."

From Table H17 it is learned that 51.4% of the early school leavers in this study participated in extra curricular activities, while 48.6% reported they did not participate. The participating group reported that "sports" was the major extra curricular activity with "clubs" and "band and music" being the second and third most common extra curricular activities.

Results in Table H18 convey the fact that 24.3% of the early school leavers in this study were suspended from school at least once while 75.7% reported they were never suspended. The main reasons given

for suspensions were "skipping classes," "fighting in school" and "disrespecting a teacher and/or principal."

It is shown in Table H19 that only 27.1% of the early school leavers said they had a learning problem. The individuals with the stated learning problems revealed that the major reasons for the learning difficulty had to do with problems comprehending subject content.

Table 16 indicates that 88.6% of the early school leavers in this study had skipped classes while 11.4% indicated they had never skipped classes without good reason. The highest rates of absenteeism were two days and one day per week. The greatest number of early school leavers indicated they started skipping school in grade 9 with grade 10 being the second most frequently mentioned grade, and junior high (grades 7 - 8) as the third most frequently skipped category. The reasons given for skipping school are listed in Table 17. The most common reasons for skipping school were "school uninteresting," "peer pressure influence," and "just wanted to be away from school."

As can be seen from Table 18 the most positive aspects of school perception of early school leavers was predominately "friends and socializing." "School in general" and "learning new content" were the second and third most frequently stated.

The negative aspects of school as reported by early school leavers are summarized in Table 19. The most negative aspects of school were "teachers hassling me," "school not interesting," and "school too organized and routine."

Table 20 indicates that 80% of the early school leavers felt positive about school at one time while 20% never felt positive about

Table 16

Frequency of Classes Skipped by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Ever Skip Classes?				
Yes	30	32	62	88.6
No	5	3	8	11.4
Frequency Skipped				
1 class per week	3	1	4	
1/2 day per week	3	2	5	
1 day per week	7	7	14	
1 1/2 days per week	1	4	5	
2 days per week	8	8	16	
2 1/2 days per week	4	5	9	
3 days per week	3	3	6	
4 days per week	1	2	3	
When Did You Begin Skipping?				
Elementary 1 - 6	2	1	3	
Junior High 7 - 8	9	6	15	
Grade 9	10	11	21	
Grade 10	10	10	20	
Grade 11	1		1	
Grade 12	1	1	2	

Table 17

Reasons for Skipping Class as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total
Reasons for Skipping			
School uninteresting	4	9	13
No reasons given	10	3	13
Peer pressure influence	6	6	12
Just wanted to be away from school	6	5	11
Hated subjects	4	3	7
Go for coffee during spare and not feel like coming back	2	3	5
Was putting nothing into school work	2	2	4
Home problems	2	1	3
Being hassled by teachers	1	2	3
Personal problems		2	2

Table 18

Positive Aspects Regarding School as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total
What Aspects Did You Like?			
Friends and socializing	26	27	53
School in general	2	7	9
Learning new content	5	3	8
Subjects	3	2	5
Sports	1	3	4
Open-climate independence	1	1	2
Recess or spares		2	2
Friendly and interested teachers	2		2
Drama	1		1
Industrial arts and music	1		1
Helping younger students		1	1
Challenging teachers		1	1

Table 19

Negative Aspects Regarding School as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total
What Aspects Did You Dislike?			
Teachers hassling me	7	7	14
School not interesting	5	8	13
School too organized and routine	5	5	10
Subjects generally	5	4	9
Teachers in general	1	8	9
Problems with subject content	4	3	7
Peers irritating me	6	1	7
Teachers not helping	3	3	6
Demand for conformity	3	3	6
Unfair treatment from teachers	2	4	6
Reports and assignments	3	3	6
Not learning anything useful	4		4
Everything about school	2	1	3
My own attitude and behaviour	1	2	3
Teachers looking down on me		2	2
Injustices caused by wide differences in school systems	1	1	2
Too much homework	1		1
Hated being controlled	1		1

Table 20

Time When Feelings Changed From Positive to Negative Toward School by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Was There a Time When You Felt Positive About School?				
Yes	28	28	56	80.0
No	7	7	14	20.0
Time of Change to Negative				
During Junior High (gr 7-9)	10	7	17	
Start of Junior High (gr 7)	9	5	14	
Always disliked school	9	5	14	
Start of Senior High (gr 10)	3	10	13	
Before Junior High	4	6	10	
During Senior High (10-12)	2	3	5	
How Did Elementary School Differ From High School?				
People cared more in elementary	12	9	21	
Elementary was more interesting	9	10	19	
High school more businesslike	7	11	18	
No difference	9	6	15	
Teachers left it up to student in high school - I had difficulty managing time		4	4	

school. Most of the early school leavers who reported feeling positively about school at one time stated that they began to develop a negative feeling toward school mostly during junior high school while the next most frequently mentioned times were the start of junior and the start of senior high. The majority of early school leavers found elementary school a more positive experience as compared to high school. The main reasons given for elementary school being a more positive experience was that "people cared more in elementary school," "elementary was more interesting," and "high school was more difficult and more business like."

It is revealed in Table 21 that 64.3% of the early school leavers in this study stated that they left school early after much thought while 18.6% left school "on the spur of the moment" and 14.3% left "after some thought."

The reasons given for leaving school are tabulated in Table 22. Ninety-six (57.5%) of the responses were categorized under school related reasons for leaving. The major reasons given under this category were "poor academic performance" and "disinterest in school due to perceived lack of meaningfulness of schooling." The third reason given was "lack of effort" on the part of the early school leaver and the fourth reason was "difficulty in getting along with teachers and/or principal." Thirty-six (21.6%) of the reasons given fell into the financial and economic category. The two major reasons in this category were "wanted to be more responsible and an adult life style" and "had a job, enjoyed making money, the independence and excitement of work." Home related problems and self related problems each accounted for 5.4% of the reasons for leaving school early. Peer

Table 21

Quickness of Early School Leaver's Decision to Leave School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
After much thought	24	21	45	64.3
Spur of the moment	6	7	13	18.6
After some thought	4	6	10	14.3
Not my decision	1	1	2	2.8

Table 22

Early School Leavers' Reasons for Leaving School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Financial - Economic	20	15	36	21.6
Wanted to be more responsible - an adult-like style	10	8	18	
Had a job, enjoyed making money, the independence, and excitement of work	8	5	13	
Needed to support other dependents	2	1	4	
My father arranged for an apprenticeship for me		1	1	
School Related	51	45	96	57.5
Academic Performance - grades were poor. I was behind and going to fail	11	10	21	
Attitude - I was disinterested in school - found it meaningless	10	10	20	
Had difficulty in getting along with teachers and/or principal	8	4	12	
Effort - I was wasting my time in school - getting and investing nothing	5	6	11	
Teachers - I disliked teachers mainly for hassling me for something I did wrong	4	4	8	
Attendance - poor attender, skipped a lot; may as well work instead of wasting time	4	3	7	
I couldn't handle the work	3	2	5	
Angry and rebelling against the societal and school systems	3	1	4	
I was expelled or suspended	1	2	3	
I didn't care to go full time; thought I could do it part-time but I didn't succeed	2	1	3	
Always disliked school immensely		2	2	

Table 22 continued ...

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Home Related	5	4	9	5.4
Had family problems	3	1	4	
Parents wanted me to support myself	2		2	
Family wanted me to quit school and help at home on the farm		1	1	
Had a fight at home, so I left home & school & went to work		1	1	
Alcoholism at home drove me to leave school		1	1	
Self Related	5	4	9	5.4
I lacked discipline, self control and motivation	2	2	4	
Personal problems	3		3	
I was in trouble with the law		2	2	
Health Related	1	2	3	1.7
Health problems	1	1	2	
I was pregnant		1	1	
Peer Related	5	3	8	4.8
Difficulty getting along with other students	3	3	6	
Friends quit so I did too	2		2	
Other Reasons	2	4	6	3.6
Drugs and alcohol contributed to my leaving school	2	3	5	3.6
Had a hockey career opportunity		1	1	.6
Total Number of Responses			167	100.0

influence accounted for 4.8% of the responses while health problems made up 1.8% of the responses. One person left school because of an opportunity to establish himself in a hockey career.

Upon examination of Table 23 it is shown that 42.9% of the early school leavers did indeed want to leave school when they did, however, 57.1% did not want to leave school but did so anyway. The factors that precipitated their leaving, are listed in Table 23. The two most frequently given reasons were "conflict with principal/teacher" and "couldn't do the work and was feeling like a failure." The third and fourth major reasons given were "fell too far behind in school work" and "school was meaningless for me, found no relevance in it." The next most frequent reasons were "had a job I wanted," "school turned me off — I was angry towards it," and "thought it was time for me to succeed at something."

It can be seen from Table H20 that 84.3% of the early school leavers reported that their decision to leave was their own idea, while 15.7% attributed the suggestion to other people. Three individuals reported it was their parent's idea, two said it was their fiance's, two each said it was the principal's or a teacher's suggestion respectively. One person said it was a friend's idea, another said the vice principal suggested it and another said the law required that he go to jail thereby necessitating his withdrawal from school. Finally, one said it was everyone's idea -- the situation demanded it. Table H20 also reveals that in 30% of the cases the parents agreed with the early school leaver's decision to leave. In 28.6% of the situations nobody agreed with the early school leavers decision, while in 14.3% of the cases friends agreed and in 12.9% of

Table 23

Precipitating Factors Affecting Early School Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Really Want To Leave?				
Yes	19	11	30	42.9
No	16	24	40	57.1
What Made You Leave When You Did?				
Conflict with Principal/teacher	10	8	18	
I couldn't do the work, felt like a failure	6	12	18	
Fell too far behind in school work	5	7	12	
School was meaningless - it had no relevance	3	8	11	
Got/had a job I wanted	2	4	6	
School turned me off. I was angry towards school	1	4	5	
Thought it was time for me to succeed at something	4	1	5	
Wanted or needed money	3	1	4	
Couldn't stand the students	2	2	4	
Personal problems	2	2	4	
Just wanted to work	2	1	3	
Parental pressures to leave because of poor performance	1	2	3	
Engaged to be married		3	3	
Kids teased/bugged me	2		2	
Friends quit	1	1	2	
Pregnancy (self or friend)		2	2	
Failed my last grade - decided to quit	2		2	
Parents forced me to quit	2		2	
Needed time to think out feelings toward school	1		1	
Family situtation - my mother was ill, I had to work on the farm	1		1	
Not getting along with parents	1		1	
Couldn't stand the unfair treatment from Principal & teachers		1	1	

the instances the principal supported the decision.

Parental reactions to their child's leaving school early are summarized in Table H21. About 30% of the early school leavers reported that their parents supported their decision to leave school. Another 31.4% stated their parents disagreed with their decision, while 27.2% said their parents assumed a neutral position. In 11.4% of the cases early school leavers reported their parents were divided regarding their decision to leave school.

It is shown in Table H22 that 77.1% of the early school leavers described their parents attitude towards school as encouraging, 18.6% said they were neutral while 4.3% described their parents as having a negative attitude towards school. The kinds of school involvement displayed by the parents of the early school leavers are stated in Table H21. The greatest form of school involvement by parents (80%) was that of "attending parent teacher interviews." About 78.6% of the early school leavers said that their parents did what they could in regard to helping them with school. Approximately 67.1% of the early school leavers reported that their parents visited the school when they were requested by school personnel to do so.

According to Table H23 it is shown that 61.4% of the early school leavers reported that they thought their decision was a good one at the time, 35.7% said it was not a good decision, while 2.9% were undecided. The most common justification of the decision to leave school was that it "relieved the pressure, it got me away from a situation I didn't like." The main reasons given for the decision not being a good one were that "I wanted or needed grade twelve," "didn't see my friends anymore," and "found only temporary relief."

As can be seen from Table H24 early school leavers did consult with the counsellor prior to leaving in 17 (24.3%) cases while 28 (40%) did not consult with the counsellor in the school. Twenty-five (35.7%) of the early leavers did not have a counsellor available in their school. In seven instances the students were encouraged to stay, and in five instances they weighed the pros and cons regarding leaving. The main reason given for not consulting the counsellor(s) was that the early school leavers "did not care to involve them."

According to Table H25 only 18.6% of the early school leavers consulted with a teacher prior to leaving school. In five instances they were discouraged from leaving while in four instances the teacher supported their decision. The main reason for not consulting with teachers was they "didn't want to involve them."

Table H26 indicates that only 19 (31.7%) of early school leavers who had a vice principal in their school consulted with him/her about their plans. In nine instances the early school leavers were discouraged from leaving school, while in four cases the decision was supported. In another four cases the decision was left up to the early school leaver with no position taken by the vice principal. The major reason given for not consulting with the vice principal was that the early school leaver "did not want to involve him/her."

It is shown in Table H27 that only 30% of the early school leavers consulted with the principal prior to leaving. In the cases where consultation did take place the early school leavers reported that in six instances the principals discouraged them from leaving while in four instances they were neutral. The main reasons given for not consulting with the principal were "we didn't get along," "I talked

with someone else," and "it wouldn't have helped." By way of contrast, Table H28 indicates that 70% of the early school leavers consulted with a friend about their decision to leave school. While in 32.6% of the instances they were discouraged from leaving school, in 31.4% of the instances their peers were neutral. The main reason given for not consulting with a friend was "its my decision—not their concern."

The future plans by early school leavers in lieu of going to school are summarized in Table 24. About 40% of the early school leavers had a job at which they were employed. Of this employed group 34.3% were in the labor force, while 5.7% were working at home. Approximately 32.8% planned on finding employment while 18.6% had no plans. About 71.4% of the early school leavers planned to return to school some day, while 21.4% did not have any plans to continue their education. About 7% of the early school leavers had considered the possibility of returning someday. Eleven (15.7%) of the early school leavers stated they would return to school if they could go to another school.

Table 25 indicates that 42.9% of the early school leavers stated that they could have been persuaded to stay in school if certain changes had been possible, while 57.1% reported there was nothing anyone could have done to persuade them to stay in school. The changes most frequently mentioned by the early school leavers that might have made them stay were "more need for individual assistance from teachers," "teachers could have made me feel less uncomfortable," and "the classes could have been more interesting and meaningful."

According to Table H29 only 15.7% of the early school leavers stated that students should be allowed to leave school before age 16,

Table 24

Early School Leavers' Future Plans in Lieu of School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Future Plans in Lieu of School				
I had a job at work	14	10	24	34.3
I planned to find a job	13	10	23	32.8
None	5	8	13	18.6
I had a job at home	2	2	4	5.7
I was going to train for a job		2	2	2.9
I was getting married	1	1	2	2.9
I was planning to go to another school		1	1	1.4
I was going to go to Tech		1	1	1.4
If No Plans - Reason				
I just wanted out	2	8	10	
Expelled		1	1	
Poor health	1		1	
Jail		1	1	
Did You Plan To Return to School Some Day?				
Yes	26	24	50	71.4
No	7	8	15	21.4
Yes, if I could go elsewhere	8	3	11	
Didn't think about it	2	3	5	

Table 25

Early School Leavers' Suggestions for

Prevention of Early School Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Was There Anything Anyone Could Have Done To Persuade You To Stay?				
Yes	16	14	30	42.9
No	19	21	40	57.1
What Could Have Been Done?				
More need for individual assistance from teachers	8	4	12	
Teachers could have made me feel less uncomfortable and more accepting	3	5	8	
Make the classes more interesting & meaningful	4	3	7	
Teacher could've encouraged me	1	4	5	
Improve the teaching - more effective teaching	2	1	3	
Have more options and fewer compulsories	1	1	2	
I would have stayed if I wasn't kicked out	1	1	2	
If I could have a job at the same time		2	2	
Teacher could discipline the students better	1		1	
Have more trades and /or vocational courses		1	1	
I would have stayed if my girlfriend was not pregnant		1	1	
Would have stayed if my family didn't need me to help them at home	1		1	
If I left my job I wouldn't get it back	1		1	
I would have stayed if I wasn't into alcohol & drugs (SELF)		1	1	
My parents could have encouraged me to stay		1	1	
If I had gotten along with the Principal	1		1	
Special clases for low achievers		1	1	

while 84.3% said they should not be allowed to leave. The major reasons given for not being allowed to leave prior to age 16 were "not old enough to make own decision" and "everyone should try to get their grade 12."

With reference to Table H30 it can be seen that 71.4% of the early school leavers had part-time jobs at one time while they were at school while 28.6% said they were never employed part-time while enrolled at school. One person reported having a full time job while going to school. The type of part-time labor most frequently reported by the early school leavers was regular employment as unskilled laborers.

Early school leavers' employment activities since leaving school are presented in Table 26. About 68.6% of the early school leavers reported spending their time employed as unskilled laborers since leaving school. The second largest category (14.3%) of employment reported was in the skilled labor category. About 10% of the early school leavers reported that they were not employed since leaving school. Approximately 42.9% stated they had been employed in at least one job, 20% reported that they had been employed in three different jobs.

According to Table H31 about 93.6% of the early school leavers perceived themselves as getting along fine with their co-workers, with nearly as many reporting getting along well with their boss. Only one (1.6%) reported getting along poorly with co-workers while 4.8% reported getting along poorly with their boss. Forty-eight (76.2%) of the early school leavers planned to stay in their present job for at least several months; 19% said they planned to leave their job soon, and 4.8% were undecided as to whether they would stay in their present

Table 26

Early School Leavers' Employment Activities Since Leaving School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%*
Employment Activities Since Leaving				
Unskilled labor	24	24	48	68.6
Skilled labor	9	1	10	14.3
Unemployed most of the time	2	5	7	10.0
Employed by parents	1	5	6	8.6
Haven't worked at all	1	3	4	5.7
Played hockey		2	2	2.8
In training program		2	2	2.8
Self employed	1		1	1.4
Homemaker		1	1	1.4
Number of Jobs Since Leaving				
One	14	16	30	42.9
Three	10	4	14	20.0
Two	5	8	13	18.6
None	1	6	7	10.0
More than three	5	1	6	8.5

*Percentage total does not equal 100 because some respondents gave more than one response.

position.

Table 27 indicates that 67.1% would like to go back to high school, 20% said they would not, while 12.9% were undecided. Table 27 also indicates that 35.7% thought they will go back to high school while 30% planned to continue their education in some alternate form rather than going back to a secondary school. When asked whether they planned on getting more education of some kind 82.9% indicated they planned to.

Upon examination of Table 28 it can be seen that 77.1% of the early school leavers have given thought to a career while 22.9% have not given the matter much thought. Of those early school leavers who have made no future plans the largest number of them "would like to train for a specific occupation/vocation." The second most frequently mentioned future plan was to "stay on the present job," and the third was "would like to find a better paying job." Most (59%) of the early school leavers have not had any contact with the school since leaving, of the group who did have contact, the most frequent purpose was to "visit school teachers and friends."

Table 29 indicates that 45.7% of the early school leavers would make the same decision regarding leaving if they had to make the decision again while 54.3% said they would not. The greatest regret about leaving was "didn't finish my grade 12." Some early school leavers that said they would make the same decision again also expressed some regrets about having left school early.

It can be seen from Table H32 that 97.1% of the early school leavers have never recommended that anyone leave as early as they did and the same number requested they did not intend to do so. Fifty

Table 27

Early School Leavers' Future Plans Regarding Going Back to School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Would You Like To Go Back To High School?				
Yes	27	25	47	67.1
No	7	7	14	20.0
Undecided	6	3	9	12.9
Do You Think You Will Go Back To High School?				
Yes	2	13	25	35.7
Some other form of schooling like correspondence, Tech or Business College	9	12	21	30.0
Never	6	3	9	12.9
Undecided	3	5	8	11.4
Good chance	2	1	3	4.3
Not likely	3	1	4	3.7
Do You Plan On Getting More Education of Some Kind?				
Yes	27	31	58	82.9
No	4	4	8	11.4
Undecided	4		4	5.7

Table 28

Early School Leavers' Future Plans Regarding A Career

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Have You Given Thought To A Career?				
Yes	28	26	54	77.1
No	7	9	16	22.9
Future Plans				
Would like to train for a specific vocation/occupation	17	15	32	
Stay at present job	9	7	16	
Would like to find a better paying job	8	3	11	
Have a business of my own	3	6	9	
Get married, raise a family	4	4	8	
Plan to go to tech school	2	2	4	
Take up a profession	1		1	
Contact With School Since Leaving				
None	22	19	41	
Visit school - teachers, friends	8	1	19	
Inquiries re: education	3	4	7	
School dances	1	2	3	

Table 29

Early School Leavers' Regrets Regarding Leaving School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
If You Had To Make The Decision Again Regarding Leaving School Early, Would It Be The Same?				
Yes	18	14	32	45.7
No	17	21	38	54.3
What Regrets Do You Have?				
Didn't finish grade 12	21	15	36	
None	9	7	16	
I didn't want to leave	3	4	7	
Wanted my grade 10	1	4	5	
Work is tough	1	2	3	
Socially bored		3	3	

percent of the early school leavers reported their relationship changed with their parents after they left school. About 47.1% said it got better while 2.9% reported it got worse; 50% reported no change. The most frequently reported positive changes were "being closer to my parents," and "better communication." Table H32 further indicates that 81.4% of the early school leavers thought their parents wanted them to return to school. Approximately 80% of the early school leavers reported they had the same friends while 4.3% said they had the same friends plus more friends than they had at school.

The changes early school leavers stated they would like to see in the school system are reported in Table 30. The five most frequently mentioned changes were "more vocational and trades courses," "improved teaching competence," "teachers need to be more caring, humane and encouraging," "better pupil-teacher relationships," and "more variety of courses with some alternatives to academics."

Examination of Table 31 indicates that 80% of the early school leavers reported that work was a better experience for them than was school while 8.6% said work was worse than school. The most frequently mentioned aspects of work that were better for the early school leavers than was school were, "more reward and fulfillment," "more meaningful," "feeling more successful and useful at work," and "more maturity and responsibility required at work." The negative comments in regard to work as compared to school were "work is harder" and "work requires more responsibility and productivity and has more pressures than does school."

The comments made by the early school leavers to the open ended question are reported in Table H33. The question asked "Is there

Table 30
Early School Leavers' Suggested Changes in School Functioning

Year	80/81	81/82	Total
What Changes Would You Like To See In the School System?			
More vocational & trades courses	11	5	16
Improved teaching competence	7	7	14
Teachers should be more caring, humane and encouraging	6	7	13
Better pupil-teacher relationships	5	7	12
More variety of courses - alternatives to academics	7	5	12
More individual attention for those having difficulty	5	5	10
School does not prepare people for outside world	7	2	9
None	4	4	8
Eliminate non-practical courses	3	4	7
To be treated more like an adult	4	3	7
More counselling service	2	4	6
More career education	4	2	6
Give students training for what they want and need	3	2	5
Teachers should be monitored more closely	4	1	5
Easier transfer from one school to another	1	2	3
Make school compulsory to gr 12		3	3
Give students chance to succeed	3		3
More tutoring & counselling services	2		2
Schools should better motivate students		3	1
School is an evil influence - should allow students to leave earlier	1		1
Better discipline in school	1		1
Let students progress at their own pace	1		1
School too big and impersonal	1		1
Need more principals with caring attitude	1		1
Eliminate spares - only have study hall. Kids take off during spares	1		1
Smoking lounge necessary		1	1
Give student more responsibility	1		1
Treat all students equally	1		1
Eliminate mass assemblies		1	1

Table 31

Early School Leavers' Comments Regarding Work Experience

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
How Has Your Work Experience Differed From School Experience?				
Work is better	30	26	56	80.0
Work is worse	2	4	6	8.6
No difference	2	2	4	5.7
Have not worked yet	2	2	4	5.7
How Is Work Better?				
More reward & fullfillment	15	9	24	34.3
More meaningful	9	10	19	27.1
Feel successful & useful at work	13	4	17	24.3
More mature responsiblity	3	10	13	18.6
Less boring, more interesting	8	3	11	15.7
Work gives you more freedom and independence	6	5	11	15.7
Feel more like a human being at work	2	9	11	15.7
Learn many new things	4	4	8	11.4
Relationships with people improved	5	3	8	11.4
Feelings about self improved	7		7	10.0
How Is Work Worse?				
Work is harder	2	4	6	8.5
Work requires more responsibility and productivity - more pressure	1	4	5	7.1
School is easier - no stress		4	4	5.7
Socially more fun at school	1		1	1.4

Note: Percentage totals are more than 100 because some leavers gave more than one response.

anything else you would like to add to the comments you already made? About 57.8% of the responses were teacher related. The two most frequent responses made were "teachers should spend more time with the students individually," and "teachers should be more caring, knowledgeable and humane." Approximately 21.9% of the responses were drug and alcohol related. The two most frequent responses in this category were "drugs and alcohol tear your value system down and probably is related to leaving school early," and "alcohol is related to people's performance inside and outside school. Alcohol causes people to not care." There were thirteen (20.3%) other responses which were categorized as general comments.

Comparison of early school leavers' perceptions with that of his/her parents and his/her teacher(s)/principal are tabulated in Table 32. Approximately 64.3% of the early school leavers perceived themselves as generally getting along satisfactorily in school while 45% of the parents and 39.1% of the teachers/principals perceived the early school leavers as getting along satisfactorily. About 31.4% of the early school leavers perceived themselves as getting along in borderline terms while 18.3% of their parents and 31.2% of the teachers perceived them similarily. Only 4.3% of the early school leavers reported themselves as getting along poorly in school while 18.3% of their parents and 23.4% of the teachers perceived them as getting along poorly. Table 32 further reveals that 57.1% of the early school leavers perceived themselves as getting along "good" with teachers while 51.7% of the parents and 51.6 of the teachers/principals perceived the early school leavers as getting along well with the teachers. Thirty percent of the early school leavers reported

Table 32

Comparison of Early School Leavers' Responses to That of His/Her Parent(s) and Teacher(s)/Principal

	Leavers		Parent(s)		Teacher(s)/ Principal	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
How Did Leaver Get Along At School In General?						
Good (satisfactory)	45	64.3	27	45.0	25	39.1
Borderline (some problems)	22	31.4	11	18.3	20	31.2
Poorly (many problems)	3	4.3	11	18.3	15	23.4
Undecided	0		1	1.7	0	
No Response	0		10	16.7	4	6.3
N =	70		60		64	
How Did Leaver Get Along With Teachers?						
Good	40	57.1	31	51.7	33	51.6
Borderline	24	34.3	11	18.3	18	28.1
Poorly	5	7.1	11	18.3	10	15.6
Undecided	1	1.4	0		0	
No Response	0		7	11.7	3	4.7
N =	70		60		64	
How Did Leaver Get Along With Principal?						
Good	21	30.0	5	8.3	23	35.9
Borderline	10	14.3	4	6.7	7	10.9
Poorly	15	21.4	3	5.0	7	10.9
Undecided	1	1.4	1	1.7	0	
No Response	0		45	75.0	23	35.9
No Contact	23	32.9	2	3.3	4	6.3
N =	70		60		64	
How Was Leaver's School Performance?						
Good	8	11.4	15	25.0	4	6.2
Borderline	27	38.6	15	25.0	14	21.9
Poor	32	45.7	18	30.0	28	43.8
Had ability but poor performance	3	4.3	6	10.0	12	18.8
No Response			6	10.0	6	9.4
N =	70		60		64	

Table 32 continued ....

	Leavers		Parent(s)		Teacher(s)/ Principal	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
How Did Leaver Get Along With Peers?						
Good	58	82.9	38	63.3	40	62.5
Borderline	5	7.1	5	8.3	12	18.7
Poor	7	10.0	5	8.3	9	14.1
No Response			12	20.0	3	4.7
N =	70		60		64	
Would You Like To See Him or Her Continue Schooling?						
Yes	47	67.1	53	88.3	25	39.1
No	14	20.0	3	5.0	22	34.4
Only if attitude improves					10	15.6
No Response					4	6.2
Undecided	9	12.9	4	6.7	3	4.7
N =	70		60		64	
Do You Think You/He/She Will Go Back to High School?						
Not Likely	4	5.7	26	43.3	25	39.1
Never	9	12.9	4	6.7	15	23.4
No Response					11	17.2
Undecided	8	11.4	11	18.3	6	9.4
Good Chance	3	4.3	5	8.3	4	6.2
Yes	25	35.7	4	6.7	3	4.7
Other Form of Education (corres, tech, bus. sch)	21	30.0	10	16.7	0	
N =	70		60		64	

themselves as getting along satisfactorily with the principal/ vice-principal while 8.3% of the parents and 35.9% of the teachers/principals perceived similar relationships between the early school leavers and the principal/vice principal. Approximately 32.9% of the early school leavers reported no contact with the principal/vice principal while 3.3% of the parents and 6.3% of the teachers/principals reported no contact between early school leavers and the principal/vice principal.

In regard to academic performances 45.7% of the early school leavers perceived themselves are performing poorly academically in school while 30% of the parents and 43.8% of the teachers/principals perceived the early school leavers as performing poorly in school. About 11.4% of the early school leavers perceived themselves as performing at a satisfactory level academically while 25% of the parents and 6.2% of the teachers/principals perceived satisfactory academic performance. A strong majority (82.9%) of the early school leavers perceived themselves as getting along well with their peers while 63.3% of the parents and 62.5% of the teachers/principals perceived good relationships between the early school leavers and their peers. About 67.1% of the early school leavers reported they would like to continue their high school education while 88.3% of the parents and 39.1% of the teachers would like to see the early school leavers continue. Approximately 35.7% of the early school leavers thought they would go back to high school, but only 6.7% of the parents and 4.7% of the teachers/principals said they thought the early school leavers would return to high school. Only 5.7% of the early school leavers said they most likely would not return to high school while 43.3%

parents and 39.1% of the teachers/principals reported the early school leavers as not likely to return.

It can be seen from Table 33 that all three groups gave school related reasons as the main early school leaving reason. About 57.5% of the early school leavers responses were school related regarding reasons for leaving school early. About 52.4% of the parent responses and 59.1% of the teacher/principal responses were also "school related reasons." The second most frequent category of reasons for leaving was "financial and economic," which accounted for 21.6% of the early school leavers' responses while 17.1% of the parents and 12.7% of the teachers/principals gave similar responses.

As can been seen the results in Table H34 indicate that 43.8% of the parents interviewed reported that their response to their child's decision to leave was to "encourage him/her to stay in school. Approximately 25% of the parents said they were neutral toward the decision and "left it up to their child to decide."

According to Table 34, 80% of the parents would like to see changes in the school program, while 20% stated that no changes were necessary. The most frequently mentioned change by parents was "better student-teacher relationships." The second was "need for more vocational courses," and the third was "school is too easy on kids, too much freedom and choice and not enough responsibility put on the students."

The teachers'/principals' perceptions of how their former students got along generally in school are reported in Table 35. About 41.7% of the teachers responding stated the early school leavers got along "good" in school. Approximately 33.3% of the teachers classified the

Table 33

Comparison of Early School Leavers' Reasons for Leaving School as Reported by Leavers Themselves, Their Parent(s) and Teacher(s)/Principal

	Leavers Responses		Parent(s) Responses		Teacher(s) Principal Responses	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
What Were The Main Reasons For Your/His/Her Leaving School?						
Financial and Economic	36	21.6	14	17.1	14	12.7
Wanted to be more responsible and have an adult life style	18		11		10	
Had a job, enjoyed the money, the independence & excitement of work	13		2		2	
Needed to support other dependents	4				1	
Father arranged for an apprenticeship	1		1		1	
School Related	96	57.5	43	52.4	65	59.1
Academic Performance - grades were poor. I was behind and going to fail	21		6		20	
Attitude - I was disinterested in school, found it meaningless	20		13		16	
Atendance - poor attender, skipped a lot; may as well work instead of wasting time	7		4		9	
I couldn't handle the work	5		7		8	
Effort - I was wasting time in school - getting and investing nothing	11		3		5	
Teachers - I disliked teachers mainly for hassling me for something I didn't do	8		2			

Table 33 continued....

	Leavers Responses		Parent(s) Responses		Teacher(s) Principal Responses	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Had difficulty in getting along with teachers/principal	12		4		2	
Always disliked school	2					
Angry and rebelling against the societal and school systems	4		2		2	
I was expelled or suspended	3				1	
I didn't care to go full time; thought I could do it part-time but I didn't succeed	3		2		1	
Home Related	9	5.4	1	1.2	5	4.5
Had family problems	4				3	
Family wanted me to quit school and help on the farm	1					
Had a fight at home, so I left home & school & went to work	1					
Alcoholism at home drove me to leave school	1		1			
Parents wanted me to support myself	2				2	
Self Related	9	5.4	4	4.8	5	4.5
Lacked discipline, self control & motivation	4		3		3	
In trouble with the law	2				1	
Personal problems	3		1		1	

Table 33 continued...

	Leavers Responses		Parent(s) Responses		Teacher(s) Principal Responses	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Health Related	3	1.8	4	4.8	4	3.6
Had a health problem	2		2		1	
Pregnant	1		2		3	
Peer Related	8	4.8	9	11.0	3	2.7
Influenced by friends who had quit school	3		5		1	
Had difficulty getting along with fellow students	5		4		2	
Other Reasons	6	3.6	7	8.6	14	12.7
Drugs	5				2	
Hockey	1		1			
Part-time job caused loss of interest in school			3		1	
Had a job, liked the money, fell behind in school & quit			3		4	
Too old					4	
Poor self-image					3	
Total	167	100.0	82	99.9	110	99.8

Table 34

Parents' Views Regarding School Program

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Would You Like To See Changes In The School Program?				
Yes	24	24	48	80.0
No	6	6	12	20.0
If "yes" what changes do you recommend?				
Better student-teacher relationship	9	11	20	
More vocational courses	4	6	10	
School is too easy on kids--too much freedom and not enough responsiblity	1	8	9	
Discipline	6	2	8	
Spares allow kids to get into trouble. Should have less spares	1	5	6	
Vocational counselling needed	5	1	6	
More counselling for the students' personal concerns	5	1	6	
More individual assistance provided to students	3	1	4	
Teachers	2	1	3	
Better parent-teacher communication	1	1	2	
Better techniques to motivate students	1	1	2	
Go back to 8 classes per year format	1		1	
Better programming so students can take classes they want	1		1	
Semester system is too intense - they study the same subject too often. Requires more variety.		1	1	
Classroom changes - students shouldn't have to run from class to class		1	1	
Too many options	1		1	
Sink-swim approach		1	1	
School was good	1		1	
School is too rigid	1		1	
Smoking policy is ridiculous	1		1	
Grade 7 shouldn't be with 9-12	1		1	
Better correspondence courses		1	1	

Table 35

Teachers'/Principals' Perceptions Regarding Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
How Did Your Former Student(s) Get Along In School?				
Good - satisfactory	13	11	25	39.1
Borderline - some problems	6	14	20	31.2
Not good - many problems	9	6	15	23.4
No response	2	2	4	6.3
Nature of Problem				
Very likeable, sociable, easy going, like a good time but lacked interest & motivation toward school work	3	4	7	
Missed a lot of school, absent most of the time	2	5	7	
Very cooperative, got along fine with everyone but had some difficulty doing the course work	4	2	6	
Very quiet, used alcohol/drugs	1	3	4	
More mature than age mates -- spent time with maturer people	4		4	
Very active social life	1	2	3	
Lacked self control & discipline	1	1	2	
No ability to do school work, very frustrated, not a good place for him	2		2	
Emotional & psychological problems	1	1	2	
Not happy at school		2	2	
Aggressive	2		2	
Poor self image	2		2	
Not a mature person	2		2	
Didn't relate well with teachers		2	2	
Liked to steal	1		1	
Shy		1	1	
Bothered by being overweight		1	1	
Home problems - got bounced around at home		1	1	
Had night job which conflicted with school		1	1	
Had attitude of despair - wanted to well but couldn't		1	1	
Very moody & changeable		1	1	
Hated authority		1	1	
Arrogant and non-cooperative		1	1	

early school leavers as borderline (some problems) while 25% said they got along poorly. The problems experienced by the early school leavers as perceived by teachers/principals are reported in Table 35 as well. The most frequently mentioned characteristics were " very likeable, sociable and easy going; liked a good time but lacked the interest and motivation toward performing school work." The second most frequently mentioned problem of the early school leavers was "missed a lot of school, absent most of the time." The third problem was that they were "very cooperative, got along fine with everyone but had some difficulty doing the course work."

With reference to Table H35 it can be seen that 51.6% of the teachers/principals agreed and/or encouraged the early school leavers to leave school. Approximately 29.7% disagreed and discouraged them from leaving school. Additional comments regarding teachers/principals responses to early school leavers' decisions to leave are contained in Table H34. The most frequent comment made was that "if the student was not achieving, it was a good idea to leave school and do something else." The second most frequent comment was that the early school leavers "could have passed grade 12 with a good effort."

It can be seen from Table H36 that 35.9% of the teachers/principals perceived the students attitude toward the early school leavers as mostly a neutral attitude; "they don't care at all." About 15.6% of the teachers/principals said they thought that the students perceive the early school leavers negatively; "they see them as losers." Some 14.1% of the teachers/principals thought the students "only care if it's a close friend."

Table H37 indicates that 27.9% of the teachers/principals said

"teachers do not like to see students leaving school early in general." About 16.2% of the teachers/principals expressed "mixed feelings depending on the student," while 13.2% of the teachers/principals voiced that "teachers try to keep students in school, they hate to see potential wasted." Nine (13.2%) teachers/principals also said that "in some cases there is no alternative to leaving -- some just waste their time."

The suggestions teachers/principals made regarding what should be done about the early school leavers' situation is summarized in Table 36. Twenty-three (16.2%) of the respondents requested "a massive parent-education program aimed at obtaining more parental support for education." Twenty-one (14.8%) of the responses indicated support for "more alternative programs for those non-academically inclined, more vocational and non-academic programs." The third most frequently mentioned suggestion was "more counselling services aimed at helping students sort out their problems."

The breakdown by grade and sex of the stay-ins interviewed in this study is given in Table H38. The sample contained 28 (45.9%) grade 10 students and 21 (34.4%) grade 11 students, 10 (16.4%) were in grade 10. A total of 61 stay-ins, were interviewed, 38 (62.3%) of whom were male while 23 (37.7%) were females.

As shown in Table H39, 24 (39.3%) of the stay-ins reported progressing unsatisfactorily and having many problems while 36.1% of the stay-ins stated they were making satisfactory progress in school. About 34.4% of the stay-ins were barely passing their courses while 32.8% said they were failing most of their subjects. Upon further examination of Table H39 it can be seen that 44.3% of the stay-ins said

Table 36

Principals'/Teachers' Perception Regarding What Should Be Done About the Early School Leaver Situation

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Massive parent education programs aimed at more parental support	8	17	23	16.2
More programs for non-academically inclined--increase number of vocational & non-academic programs	5	16	21	14.8
More government financial support for programs and staff	5	16	19	13.4
More counselling service aimed at helping student sort out problems	4	11	15	10.6
More community support for the value of education	6	5	11	7.7
School has limited resources--more resources required to do a better job of teaching and provide more program variety	5	4	9	6.3
Work study program	5	4	9	6.3
Better school liaison with parents	5	3	8	5.6
Early identification of leavers and provide remediation	2	5	7	4.9
A societal environmental problem for socio-economic class disadvantaged	1	4	5	3.5
More special service for problem students	1	4	5	3.5
Individualized program aimed at developing more self confidence in students	1	2	3	2.1
A better attitude toward work must be developed	1	1	2	1.4
School should provide apprenticeship programs		2	2	1.4
The commitment must come from the student--the school is prepared to help those who ask for it	1	1	2	1.4
A re-entry program for those who have left and returned		1	1	1.7
Total			142	99.8

they were getting along fine with the teachers, while 26.2% reported a borderline situation with their teachers. Sixty (98.4%) of the stay-ins said they were getting along well with other students.

As reported in Table H40, "being with their friends and socializing" was mentioned 47.6% of the time as the most positive feature regarding school. Stay-ins stated that "I learn new information" as the second most liked aspect about school.

Table H41 shows that stay-ins reported "teachers in general" as the most disliked aspect of school. The second most frequently mentioned dislike was "classes and subjects in general" and "school is boring" as the third.

It can be seen from Table H42 that 68.8% of the stay-ins interviewed said they had considered leaving school at one time. About 54.8% said that leaving school had been on their mind recently, 11.9% stated they did leave school for a while.

Stay-ins' reasons for planning to leave school are listed in Table 37. The main reasons for considering abandonment of school early were "lack of school success," "not being interested in school subjects," "all round dissatisfaction," and "dissatisfaction with teachers."

As shown in Table 38 the three most often mentioned precipitating factors which caused the stay-ins to consider leaving school were "fell behind in my work," "run in with teacher/principal" and a "combination of things."

Information reported in Table 39 indicates that "parents" and "wanting my grade 12 were the two main reasons given by stay-ins for remaining in school".

With reference to Table H43 it can be seen that 57.4% of the

Table 37

Stay-ins' Reasons for Planning to Leave School

	Total	%
Why Were You Thinking Or Leaving School Early?		
Performance - I'm not succeeding at school, not doing well	9	12.7
Subjects - I'm not interested in the school subjects	8	11.3
All around dissatisfaction	8	11.3
Dissatisfaction with teachers	8	11.3
Needed money	6	8.4
Teachers - hassle me about my behavior	6	8.4
Just wanted to get out - have a break	5	7.0
Bored - school irrelevant	5	7.0
Wanted to go to work	5	7.0
Personal problems	2	2.8
Peer hassles	2	2.8
Home problems	2	2.8
Poor attendance	1	1.4
Teachers - don't seem to care about their subjects - no enthusiasm	1	1.4
Counsellor suggested it	1	1.4
Kicked out	1	1.4
Would like to leave but need an education	1	1.4
Total	71	99.8

Table 38

Stay-ins' Perceptions of Precipitating Factors Related to Thinking of Early School Leaving

	Total	%
Did Anything In Particular Happen At That Time You Thought of Leaving?		
Fell behind in my work	9	21.4
Run in with teacher/principal	7	16.7
Combination of things	7	16.7
Needed/wanted money	3	7.1
Report cards	3	7.1
Decided I need more education	2	4.8
Home problems	2	4.8
No alternatives, decided to stay	1	2.4
Suspended	1	2.4
Moved to a new school	1	2.4
Just thought it would be better for me to work	1	2.4
Want to be independent	1	2.4
Boring	1	2.4
Personal problems	1	2.4
Peer hassles	1	2.4
Peers dropped out	1	2.4
Total	42	100.2

Table 39

Stay-ins' Reasons for Staying

	Total	%
What Made You Decide To Stay?		
Parents	1	25.0
Wanted my grade 12	1	25.0
Would miss my friends	4	9.1
Wanted my grade 10	2	4.5
Not old enough to leave	2	4.5
Almost finished, might as well continue	2	4.5
Poor future chances	2	4.5
Talked myself into it	2	4.5
Principal convinced me to stay	1	2.3
V/P convinced me to stay	1	2.3
Teacher convinced me to stay	1	2.3
Couldn't find job/laid off	1	2.3
Bored at home	1	2.3
Went to another school	1	2.3
Value education	1	2.3
Counsellor	1	2.3
Total	44	100.0

stay-ins did talk to somebody regarding the possibility of leaving school. The people most frequently talked to were friends, both parents, and a counsellor. Approximately 45.9% of the stay-ins reported that the situation changed regarding their notion of leaving school. When asked what changed in their situation, the most frequent comment was "decided on my own to stay" and "my parents helped me to decide to stay."

Table H44 indicates that 91.8% of the stay-ins did report knowing a person who left school early. The four most common given reasons for leaving were "they had a negative attitude towards school," "they wanted to work instead," " conflict with teacher(s) and/or principal," and "had difficulty with subjects."

It is shown in Table H45 that 30.3% of the stay-ins who knew early school leavers encouraged them to stay in school, while 28.6% were neutral and had no involvement with the early school leavers. About 23.2% of the stay-ins encouraged the early school leavers to leave school. Approximately 39.3% disagreed with their decision to leave while 25% were neutral and didn't care one way or another.

As can be seen the results in Table H46 reveal that 54.1% of the stay-ins would like to see those early school leavers return to school while 26.2% were neutral or undecided. However, 57.4% thought that the early school leavers would never return to high school.

Table H47 shows that 36.1% of the stay-ins perceived teachers as encouraging students to leave school early while 34.4% thought that teachers encouraged students to stay in school.

As shown in Table H48 the most frequent comments made by stay-ins regarding student attitudes toward early school leavers were "student

tends to look down on them and regard them as failures," "students are neutral, they don't care," and "students regard leaving as a waste of potential and opportunity." The majority 63.9% of the stay-ins reported that the early school leaving situation was not a concern to them. Of those stay-ins (36.1%) who were concerned about the early leaving situation the two most frequent comments were "people are cheating themselves of an education by leaving," and "I think it is wrong to

leave, but they can leave if they want."

The reasons given by stay-ins regarding why students leave school early are presented in Table 40. The three most frequent reasons mentioned were "negative attitude toward school," "find school uninteresting," and "have difficulties getting along with teachers."

Stay-ins' suggestions for handling the early school leaving situation are reported in Table 41. The two most mentioned categories of suggestions were teacher related (40%) and classes related (25.1%). The teacher related suggestions most commonly mentioned were "better teacher attitude toward students" and "teachers should give students more individual help and attention." The suggestions regarding classes most frequently mentioned were "more trades and vocational courses" and "there should be a variety of classes to choose from."

D. DISCUSSION OF QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE (QSL) RESULTS

The analysis of the QSL data did not produce any significant differences among the levels or status factors. The implication appears to be that early school leavers and stay-ins tend to perceive their quality of school life similarly regardless of whether they are from a high, medium or low early school leaving school. It is interesting to note that the QSL scale means for both status and level

Table 40

Stay-ins' Perceptions Regarding Why Students Leave Early

	Total
Negative attitude regarding school	47
Find school boring	26
Have difficulty getting along with teachers	15
Can't handle the work, classes too difficult	13
Too far behind in classes because of neglect	13
Alcohol/drugs cause student to lose sight of their goals	9
Want to get started in work	9
Can't tolerate schooling process	5
Home problems	5
Pressure - harrassed by teachers	4
Can't stand it, want freedom from oppression	3
Teachers show lack of enthusiasm and motivation	2
Favouritism	2
Work interfers with school	2
Want independence, freedom, money	2
Want to get satisfaction from succeeding in adult work	1
Feel out of place	1
Total	159

Table 41

Stay-ins' Suggestions for Handling Early School Leaving Situation

	Total
Teacher Related Suggestions	
Better attitude toward pupils	42
Teachers should give students more individual help and attention	21
Teachers should make their job more interesting through motivation and delivery	8
Better communication between student and teacher	6
Students should have choice of teachers	4
Total	81
Classes - Curriculum/Program	
There should be a variety of classes to choose from	13
More trade and vocational classes	20
The classes should be more meaningful & interesting	9
Too much emphasis on academic courses and more practicality	6
Need school time for homework	2
Work/school programs 50/50 split or whatever	1
Total	51
School In General	
School should be made to be more interesting & exciting	7
Should have a smoking lounge	6
Bigger Phys Ed facilities - sports for everyone	3

Table 41 continued....

School In General... continued	
More selection in library	1
Student parking lots	1
New school required	1
Total	79
Better parent/teacher/student communication	13
Counselling	
Can be helpful for talking over & solving problems	6
More vocational counselling	3
Total	9
General Comments	
Bring in more community resource people	6
Administration needs changing	5
More discipline	5
Less discipline	3
Make school more pleasant	3
Need teamwork approach - involve students, parents, staff - all shape up and pull together	2
It's a decision everyone must make for themselves - don't blame the school	2
School shouldn't be responsible for student life	2
Students have too much responsibility, too much freedom	1
School is alright, students are too inflexible	1
Total	30

factors tended to cluster around the scale mid point (12.5). The frequency counts indicate that individual differences did exist, with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"; however, the collective perceptions of the quality of school life tended to be rather neutral. Similarly, early school leavers, who had been more than eight months out of school and those who had been less than six months out of school, and stay-ins are similar in their characteristics as well as their perception of quality of school life. The reasons why some students leave school early while other characteristically similar students remain in school do not appear to pertain to their perceptions of quality of school life. The results of this study tend to indicate that stay-ins are similar to early school leavers in many respects and that in time they may leave school early as well. Similarly, the findings of this study indicate that students' perceptions of the quality of school life does not affect the early school leaving rate of a school.

The theoretical position reflected in this study was that early school leaving rates were positively correlated with early leavers' perceptions of their quality of school life. This study did not produce any significant differences between rates of leaving school and student perceptions of quality of school life. In retrospect it may be feasible to sample the academically successful students in the school as well as the early leavers. In this study the early leavers did not differ in their perceptions of quality of school life regardless of the level of early school leaving reported for their school. It might be that early school leavers had a similar view of school regardless of the quality of school life that existed within their school. It might

also be possible that early school leavers may not be capable of discriminating between a positive school environment and a negative one. Therefore, it would be logical to determine the quality of school life as perceived by representative samples of students from different schools and then relate those perceptions to early school leaving rates. The same explanation may apply to the stay-ins as well since they displayed similar perceptions and attitudes toward school as did the early leavers, they too, may not be able to discriminate between a positive and negative school environment.

In regard to duration of time out of school no significant differences were found between the two early school leaving groups. The reason for this finding may be the same as mentioned above in that duration of time out of school does not have an effect on the leavers perceptions of quality of school life. It has been reported, by several researchers (Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978) that leavers' attitudes toward school tend to mellow with time. This may be the result of leavers regreting not having obtained their grade 12 diploma, rather than a change in perception of their quality of school life. They may still perceive the school environment similarly as when they left, but their desire for a grade 12 diploma has increased, which may account for a change in attitude toward school.

The research literature on quality of school life is rather sparse. The early school leaving phenomena has never been related to the students' perceptions of quality of school life. It may be necessary in the future to compare early school leaver characteristics to categories of students other than early leavers and their age-mate stay-ins. Future studies on early school leavers might be conducted so

that school contextual variables and the quality of learning experiences and their interactions may be assessed in order to establish some linkage.

E. REASONS FOR LEAVING

In regard to reasons and causes for leaving school early, personal, school-related and economic factors were considered. The major personal factor for leaving school early was "I quit school because I wanted more freedom." Over one half (53%) of the early leavers agreed that this item was a factor for their leaving school early. The implication in this regard is that early leavers felt restricted in their school environment. Apparently their school experiences were not congruent with their personal needs. The second personal factor for leaving school early pertained to personal problems (worries). About 40% of the early leavers indicated that personal problems were a contributing factor to their leaving. However, the nature of these problems was not specified.

Among the school-related factors "dissatisfaction with content," "program," "teachers" and "school rules" were rated as the main reasons and causes for early school leavers' departures from school. These school-related reasons for leaving school early are corroborated by the interview results.

"I left school because I felt I was wasting my time" was the major economic factor given by early leavers as a reason for their leaving. This factor closely corresponds to the school-related factors. Wasting ones time tends to imply a disinterest and a feeling of irrelevance towards tasks and activities being offered. The second economic factor with the highest mean was "I wanted to look for a job and go to work so

I left school." Examination of this factor may suggest that the early leavers were searching for meaningful and economically rewarding activities. There is moderate support for the notion that "desire for more spending money" was a contributing factor to early school leaving. The interview results tend to suggest that desire for more spending money was related to the notion of independence and an adult-like lifestyle rather than an actual economic need. Several recent studies concur with the above assessment (see Stobo, 1973).

In terms of assistance received by early school leavers the results indicated that the guidance counsellor was perceived as being moderately helpful, while the principal was perceived as not being helpful. It should be noted that the principal is usually regarded as the ultimate authority person in the school. Perhaps in some instances it may have been difficult for the principal to be helpful while enforcing the "law" in the school. The counsellor, on the other hand, is usually designated as the "helping" person; therefore, it would be expected that counsellors be perceived as being more helpful than the principals.

In regard to support received by the early school leavers, the results indicated that mothers supported the early school leavers decision to leave school more so than did the fathers. This may be due to the belief that mothers are usually more nurturant and caring and therefore, more supportive of their child's decision.

F. DISCUSSION OF INTERVIEW RESULTS

The three individuals analyzing the interview data concluded that there were not any noteworthy differences between the 1980-81 early school leavers and the 1981-82 leavers. It was judged that any

differences that are reflected by the tabulated results are too small to be considered a meaningful difference. The interview results corroborated the QSL results that no discernible differences were observed when comparing the 1980/81 early school leavers' to 1981/82 leavers' perceptions of their school environments.

The interview results did not yield data which indicated that early school leavers' perceptions were notably different from the stay-ins' perceptions. The interview results similarly did not yield differences in perceptions of their school experiences between the less that 6 months out and more than 8 months out early leavers. The fact that the QSL data and the interview data yielded similar results provides indirect support for the validity of the QSL measures.

In terms of "General Affect" the interview results indicated that students varied in their general satisfaction with school. Students indicated there were some things they felt positive about in school while they felt negative about certain experiences. The general level of satisfaction in regard to school appeared to be more negative than positive. Specifically, the respondents generally felt positive about socializing with their peers, while they felt negative about some of their teachers and the courses. This may partially explain why the QSL scores tended to cluster around the mean.

In regard to "Identity", "Status", "Teacher-student relationships" and "Opportunity" dimensions the interview results corroborated the empirical findings that no discernable differences were detected between the two types of early leaves and the stay-ins.

The interview results pertaining to teacher-pupil interaction appeared to be more negative than the empirical results. In attempting

to explain this apparent difference, it may be related to the two methods employed in obtaining the data. The self reports may have a tendency to produce more socially desirable responses than interview results. Once rapport is established in the interview situation students may feel more open to reveal and elaborate on specific experiences they may have had in school.

The early school leavers in this sample were males more often than females (40%). This ratio of male to female early school leavers is characteristically similar to ratios reported by other studies (e.g., Green 1966; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer 1978). The popular months for leaving school were October and February. This information seems to imply that students had some intent to continue their high school education but gave up one month after the beginning of a new semester.

The majority of the parents of the early school leavers were employed in unskilled and skilled labor categories and their educational attainment was mostly less than grade eleven. The early school leavers frequently came from families of five or more children and over half of them had siblings precede them in leaving school early. This finding is similar to other studies reported in the literature (Stevens, 1965; Bowman & Mathews, 1960; Bachman et al., 1971; Archer, 1978; Watson, 1975; Larter & Eason, 1978). This sample of early school leavers and their parents were predominantly English speaking and Canadian born.

Nearly one half of the leavers had attended four or more schools during their school attending years. This finding coincides with the literature. Bledsoe (1959), Sharp and Kristjanson (1965), Brockman and

Reeves (1967) obtained similar results in their studies. Over half of the early school leavers had failed a complete grade prior to leaving school, with grade seven the most frequently failed grade and grades nine and ten being the next most often failed. This finding is also supported by the literature (e.g., Zeller, 1966; Greene, 1966; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Bachman et al. 1971, 1978; Zamenzadeh & Prince 1978). School failure appears to be a common characteristic that most early school leavers and their age-mate stay-ins share. The reasons for failure appear to reflect school adjustment problems to a considerable extent; yet 64.3% of the early leavers reported general satisfaction with school and only 4.3% reported poor general satisfaction. Over half of the early leavers reported they were getting along fine with teachers, while only 7.1% said they were getting along poorly with teachers. A high majority (82.9%) reported they were getting along satisfactorily with their peers; however, 84.3% reported their school performance as being poor or borderline. The above information appears to imply that early school leavers perceived many aspects of school as positive, but their academic failure in school was an important factor in their leaving. As previously mentioned in the literature academic failure is one of the most reliable indicators of future early school leaving (e.g., Zeller, 1966; Green, 1966; Reich & Young, 1975: Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Bachman et al., 1978).

While 57.1% of the early school leavers did not talk to teachers regarding personal concerns, the same percentage reported getting along satisfactorily with teachers. The above comments appear to suggest that teacher-pupil relationships in many instances were not congenial

to the extent that early leavers could freely consult with their teachers. The majority of the comments regarding the teacher qualities liked and disliked referred to the teacher-pupil relationship factors. Specifically, the early school leavers reported their desire for "understanding and caring," "assistance when required," "taking time to talk to you" and being "friendly and personable." Similarly, they reported their dislike for teachers by the following statements: "not showing any caring towards students," "negative attitude towards students," "never showing interest in students." These comments are similar to those cited in other studies (e.g., Green, 1966; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Larter & Eason, 1978). The interview data reveal a similar situation existed between the early school leavers and their principal and/or vice-principal. A logical conclusion is that early school leavers perceived teacher/principal/vice-principal-pupil relationships as needing improvement.

About half (51.4%) of the early leavers reported that they had participated in extra curricular activites while at school. This finding somewhat contradicts the finding reported in the literature. An overwhelming number of studies revealed that early school leavers do not participate in school activites (e.g., Cervantes, 1965; Greene, 1966; Bachman et al., 1972; Reich & Young, 1975; Archer, 1978). It was found in this study that sports was not only the main extra curricular activity but also one of the favorites.

A majority of early school leavers in this sample reported having problems doing school work. The most popular method for handling the problems encountered at school was "ignore them, to do nothing and not

ask for help." These comments are similar to those reported by Reich & Young (1975), Watson (1975), Archer (1978). It is interesting to speculate how the early school leaver reached such a self-defeating conclusion. One might speculate that it is easier to keep quiet than to ask what might appear to others to be a silly question. Perhaps it is for this reason that in most secondary classrooms the students who do most of the talking are the students who are doing well in their school work. The other students are caught in a vicious circle. Although they need the aid of the teacher, they will not ask questions for fear the other students will perceive them as not being able to understand the work and this may be too much of a blow to their ego.

Many early school leavers felt they needed additional help from the teacher and this help was not forthcoming. It seems they could not bring themselves to ask for help because of their own embarassment. What they apparently desired was a teacher who was able to recognize when they needed help and was able to provide this help discreetly, without letting the entire class know that this student needed additional assistance.

The early school leavers frequently skipped classes. About 88.6% of the these individuals had skipped classes without good reason. This phenomena is reported as being typical for early school leavers (e.g., Barnes, 1973; Archer, 1978; Larter & Eason, 1978; Stobo, 1973). The frequency of truancy was one to two days per week. This was done in order to avoid school. School was attended primarily to socialize and at times being hassled by teachers interfered with this motive.

It was found that the early school leavers left school after giving it much thought, and only a few left on the spur of the moment.

School-related reasons accounted for the majority of the responses. Financial or economic reasons accounted for only 21.6% of the responses. Data from the survey form and the interview produced similar results. Academic difficulties appeared to account for the majority of reasons and precipitating factors in regards to leaving school. For most of the leavers the decision was their own. They did not do much consulting with parents, teachers, counsellors, or principals; but rather, mostly consulted with their friends. The reasons for not consulting with more experienced adults was that they didn't want to involve or bother them. For most of the early leavers the immediate benefit was relieving the pressure brought on by school and most of them either had a job or were going to look for a job. About 71.4% of the leavers planned on returning to school at a later date. Over half of the leavers felt there was nothing anyone could have done to persuade them to stay in school. About 42.9% could have been persuaded to stay if they received "more individual assistance from teachers," if "teachers made them feel less uncomfortable," and if the "classes could have been more interesting and meaningful." Once again the inability of the early school leavers to cope with academic failure appears to direct the early leavers away from school. Similar findings were reported elsewhere (e.g., Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Larter & Eason, 1978).

Many (71.4%) of the early school leavers had engaged in part-time employment while enrolled in school. When one attempts to rationalize why students who are having academic difficulties would add an additional burden of part-time work, the answer appears to be that employment provided more status fulfillment and relevance to their

lives than school. This conclusion is corroborated by the interview data which indicated that 80% of the leavers found work to be a better experience than school. Several other studies have produced similar findings (e.g., Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978).

The majority of early school leavers valued school and had strong desires to complete their grade 12. Their greatest regret for leaving was that they did not complete their grade 12. It appears that early leavers attach considerable importance to the value of completing their grade 12, but circumstances with which they could no longer cope made them depart from their goal. To substantiate this conclusion 97.1% of the leavers said they never have and never would recommend anyone to leave school as early as they did.

The early leavers made several suggestions pertaining to school functioning. The first suggestion was for "more vocational and trades courses." The second suggestion was for "improved teacher competence" as well as "more caring and humane behavior on the part of teachers." The third suggestion, related to the first two, was for better pupil-teacher relationships. The responses to the open ended question revealed similar teacher-related comments. The issue of drugs and alcohol was also raised in response to the open-ended question. There is some evidence to indicate that drugs and alcohol interfered with the pursuit of grade 12 attainment. The use of drugs and alcohol was also mentioned as the most popular leisure time activity engaged in by early school leavers when spending time with their classmates.

It is interesting to note that early school leavers rarely blamed themselves for their inability to complete their high school education. One must raise the question of whether early school leavers have the

ability to assume responsibility for their own fate.

There are several interesting comparisons between the responses of early leavers, their parents, and their teachers. The leavers perceived themselves as getting along in school better than did their parents or teachers. The leavers also perceived themselves as getting along satisfactorily with their peers more often than did the parents and teachers/principals.

While the leavers were fairly desirous in continuing their schooling, the parents were even more in favour of their child continuing school. However, the teachers/principals were not nearly as positive in wanting the early leavers to continue their schooling, and were more pessimistic in regards to the chances of early school leavers returning to school. The early school leavers showed more optimisim in this regard than did the parents or teachers/principals. This may be due to an over estimation by the early leavers of their own progress or perhaps wishful thinking.

In regard to the reasons for leaving school early there was considerable agreement among early leavers, parents and teachers/principals. This can justifiably be interpreted as all three parties perceiving the phenomena of early school leaving similarly.

The parents perceived themselves to be more supportive toward their children continuing their schooling than was reported to be the case by the early leavers. Stobo (1973) addressed this issue and reported that parents perceptions varied a great deal from one sample to another. Teachers/principals perceived themselves being in agreement more often (51.6%) with the early school leavers decision to leave school early than what was reported by the early leavers. The

early leavers perceived only 12.9% of the principals and 7.1% of the vice-principals and 2.9% of the teachers agreeing with their decision to leave. The high percentage of teachers/principals agreeing with early leavers departing from school can probably be explained by the statement that teachers/principals apparently "do not like to see students leaving school early in general," however, "for some there is no alternative, they appear to be wasting their time." Teachers reported that "for some students leaving is a positive move to activities which are more in line with their interests and capabilities." The above comments appear to indicate that teachers feel that in some instances it is pointless to keep a student in school.

An interesting alignment of perceptions is apparent in the changes of school functioning that early school leavers, their parents, their teachers/principals and the stay-ins would like to see. The early leavers, their parents and the stay-ins reported an abundance of teacher related comments, while teachers mainly focused on program alternatives. There appears to be a strong agreement in regards to changes in school program among all four groups of interviewees. Strong consensus emerged in regard to the following alternatives: "more vocational and trades courses," "more programs for non-academically inclined students," and "more counselling and special services for those students having difficulty." The teachers/principals most frequently stated a need for "massive parent education programs aimed at eliciting parental support." It appears that teachers/principals are wanting more support from parents, community and governments to enhance the status and quality of education. The

early leavers, their parents, and the stay-ins appeared to want an improvement in the quality of teaching primarily. These groups would also like to see more alternative programs and support services for the non-academically inclined students. Such suggestions for changes are commonly found in the literature (e.g., Sellick, 1965; Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978).

The stay-ins had very similar perceptions to those reported by the early school leavers. Both groups reported having problems doing the academic work in school. They also reported that "friends and socializing" was the most positive aspect of school, while teachers in general was the most disliked aspect of schooling. A moderately high percentage (68.8%) of stay-ins had considered leaving school at one time. The reasons given for wanting to leave are similar to the early leavers' responses; "lack of school success" and "not being interested in school subjects." The reasons given for staying in school were "parents" and "wanting my grade 12." The only detectable difference beween the stay-ins and the early leavers is that the stay-ins appeared to be more intent in continuing their education and their parents were less tolerant of their wanting to leave than the parents of the early leavers. The stay-ins also appeared to receive more support and assistance than the early leavers from friends, parents, and counsellors. This support and assistance may have enabled them to stem the tide of crisis in their lives and thereby not being pressured into making a critical decision of whether to leave school.

Dissatisfaction with school has been the primary school related complaint reported by early leavers, their parents, and stay-ins. This factor is so broad that it defies explicit definition. It includes,

among other things, dislike for teachers, dislike for certain subjects, failing, not getting along with other students, or that school does not offer the subjects desired. Hewitt and Johnson (1979) reported that dissatisfaction with school has recently replaced economic and personal reasons as the most frequently cited reasons for leaving school early. Several Canadian studies corroborate this finding (Reich & Young, 1975; Watson, 1976; Archer, 1978; Larter & Eason, 1978).

CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of the empirical and interview data are discussed in this chapter. Particular attention is given to pointing out the implications and conclusions derived from the two sources. Several recommendations are offered in an attempt to better meet the needs of early school leavers.

Early school leavers and stay-ins perceived their quality of school life similarly regardless of whether they were from a high, medium or low early school leaving school. This implies that the rate of early school leaving does not appear to affect the early leavers' perceptions of their quality of school life. Furthermore, early school leavers, who had been out of school for a duration of more than eight months did not differ in their perceptions of quality of school life when compared to early leavers who had been out of school for duration less than six months. Duration of time out of school does not appear to alter early leavers' perceptions of their quality of school life. The conclusion derived from the above results is that early leavers and their age-mate stay-ins tend to perceive their school environments similarly. This was corroborated by the interview data which indicated that early school leavers and stay-ins displayed similar attitudes and opinions in regard to the early school leaving issue. There was a tendency for the QSL scale means for both status and level factors to cluster around the scale mid point. The interview data also indicated that subjects' responses varied greatly from extremely positive to extremely negative. This variation may be a reflection of the state of indecisiveness of the subjects sampled. It may not be possible to

characterize early school leavers on the basis of some simple descriptors.

The reason why no significant differences were found in this study may be due to the small between group variances. This appears to be caused by the fact that the early school leavers and stay-ins are characteristically similar in their perceptions of the QSL as measured by the instrument used in this study. This factor is corroborated by the interview data which did not produce any noticeable differences between the groups. The early school leavers and the stay-ins appeared to be similar in their perceptions of their school experiences.

The interview data yielded convincing evidence that early school leaving is a symptom of a fundamental mismatch between student and school. This collision between an individual with basic problems and limitations and the typical high school environment as frequently portrayed in the literature (e.g., Bachman et al., 1972; Watson, 1975; Archer, 1978; Reich & Young, 1975; Larter & Eason, 1978) is further substantiated by this study. Whether the responsiblility be assigned to the early school leaver, or to the school environment he leaves, remains a puzzling question.

It is apparent that early school leaving creates some difficulties for the early leavers as well as society at large. Early school leavers will enter the work force in an era of high technology. This is, it seems, the time when high levels of literacy on the part of the workforce are needed to cope with the demands of future jobs. It seems, at the present moment, approximately 74% of those who are on social assistance in Saskatchewan are without grade 12 diplomas (Star Phoenix, Feb 23, 1983). Two choices appear likely. Firstly, to

augment the school resources substantially in order that the rate of the young people leaving school without grade 12 diplomas might be reduced. This calls for substantial investment in education in the hope that the present dependency of those with low levels of education on social assistance is minimized. However, it is quite likely that, with the successful implementation of the effort to increase the graduation rate, the future unemployed will be more educated. Secondly, to ignore the problem of early school leaving with the belief that this phenomenon will persist regardless of what is done to make the schools and programs more attractive to potential early school leavers. This rather pessimistic and undesirable perspective on this issue may have serious socio-cultural consequences. The offsprings of those with low levels of education and poor socio-economic status generally end up in the familar tracks of the parents. In order to circumvent the resultant socio-cultural decay it may be more prudent to invest early in the programs designed to ameliorate the dropout propensity.

According to the interview results about 20% of the early school leavers left school in the month of October. The second highest percentage rate for leaving school early occurred in the month of February. Both October and February might be the critical months because by the time students have spent about one or two months in school they have had enough evidence on what is to follow in the subsequent months. Leaving school at this time might be a reasonable choice if the perception of the quality of the school experience and of the capacity to cope with the situation of the student is negative. The interview results amply corroborate the negative feelings the

respondents had towards school. It was also evident that a very high proportion of early school leavers in fact had failed one or more grades prior to their departure from school. It appears that academic failure accompanied by a negative attitude towards school are the usual prerequisites for leaving school early.

The interview results indicated that grades 10 and 11 are the critical grades for early school leavers. These findings are consistent with several Canadian studies (see Stobo, 1973). Unless academic and attitudinal variables are altered in such a way that the potential early leaver begins to experience success and to perceive the school context positively it might be impossible to prevent the potential dropout from becoming a reality. The decision to leave school was found to be deliberate and regrettable. The implication is that early leavers did not want to terminate their high school education, but felt they had no choice under the circumstances.

Another important predictor of dropout propensity is the rate of absenteeism. The early school leaver skipped school on the average of one day per week, which is substantially higher than among persisters. American and Canadian studies report similar findings (e.g., Archer, 1978; Barnes, 1973; Bowman & Matthews, 1960; Larter & Eason, 1978; Stevens, 1965: Stobo, 1973). Absenteeism as an important and significant factor emerges from its dual role as a symptom of an underlying problem and as an immediate cause or precipitating factor of the final act of leaving school.

The average family size of the early school leaver subjects in this study was about seven, which seems to compare well with the similar statistics reported in the Ontario studies (see Stobo, 1973;

Watson, 1975). The parents and older siblings generally were reported to have had less than high school education. Also, the general economic background of the parents of the early leavers was found to be significantly below average. It would appear that children from large families, lower socio-economic status homes and with one or more older siblings as early school leavers are at high risk of leaving school early. If school personnel are aware of the socio-cultural and economic background of the at risk children and begin to notice absenteeism and poor academic performance then they are well advised to institute preventive intervention strategies. These should take the form of academic intervention, modifying the academic program in terms of the number of subjects, the type of subjects, extention of time allotted for completion of the especially rigorous courses, providing access to and encouraging the use of guidance and counselling services and so on.

School-related economic factors appeared to be the most commonly cited major reasons for leaving school early. The interview results demonstrated that school-related factors were the most commonly cited factors for leaving school early and the frequency of personal reasons was found to be substantially low. This may be due to the fact that in tabulating the interviewees' responses into the various categories a large number of responses which might have been considered as personal were included in the school-related reasons category. Early leavers seldom assumed responsibility for their academic failure which may have accounted for the low frequency of responses in the personal reasons category. The high percentage of school-related reasons for leaving school is not surprising because the act of leaving school might have a

major school-related component. Of course, other variables such as economic and personal circumstances might also be critical under certain conditions.

It seems that over the last four decades economic reasons for leaving school early have become less pronounced. Hence, social and cultural shifts in any society might concommitantly alter the relative significance of various factors known to be related to the phenomenon of early school leaving. It is interesting to note that the most often mentioned specific school-related reasons were problems with the teachers/principals and the impossiblity of transfer to another school. It is not clear, however, what factors made teachers and principals the main target of criticism by the early leavers. What seems likely is that there might be status and role conflicts between the staff and the students. The teachers and principals are expected to maintain order, and to plan and direct instructional activities and have assigned authority in carrying out the mandate of the school boards. The students, on the other hand, are passive recipients of instructional and other directives which ultimately lead the adolescents to resent the perceived undue authority and power of the school personnel. Such a conflict is more likely to occur where societal permissiveness is paramount, respect for authority is on the wane, and the sense of responsiblility is minimal. Whether Saskatchewan is typified by the above characterization is left for the reader to decide.

A. RECOMMENDATONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. It may be possible that conceptually there are weaknesses in the manner in which various QSL scales correlate with each other as well as to other existing instruments which are assumed to measure the same or

similar contructs. In the original Williams and Batten (1981) instrument as well as the modified instrument there has not been any attempt made to relate these scales to other scales on the basis of sound theoretical premises. In order to test the conceptual soundness of the QSL scales it would be necessary to relate these QSL scales to other similar scales.

2. Prior to consideration of the modification of QSL measures the scales should be administered to a general population of students where schools would be expected to be characteristically different on the QSL measures.

3. Research on contextual effects upon school achievement has been inconclusive. Further research might be necessary to determine whether there is a relationship between QSL measures and school achievement.

4. Most of the research, like the present study, on this topic has been a one shot effort. In order to fully understand the phenomenon of early school leaving, its antecedents and consequences, serious consideration might be given to launching a longitudinal study in this country.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICAL APPLICATION

In light of the research methodology used in this investigation and findings a number of recommendations have surfaced. These recommendations are offered in the hope of providing specific actions and strategies to deal with the phenomenon of early school leaving if it is felt the problem is serious enough. It must be noted that the recommendations given below are not listed in any order of importance. The readers are expected to evaluate the specific context of school and other related factors and then decide if any of these proposed

recommendations are applicable to their particular situation.

1. Based on the interview data consideration should be given to a variety of alternative school programs. Wherever these alternatives can be implemented, an effort should be made to inform the adults and students in the community on the value and the consequences of each of these programs. In order to alleviate the failure syndrome experienced by most early school leavers, the provision of special programs might be considered. The primary objective of these programs would be to provide certain students with an opportunity to attain a measure of success in some aspect of their school life. The provision of vocational and technical programs or the implementation of work study programs might provide the necessary positive experiences for the non-academically inclined students.

2. The fact is that there is a high degree of mobility in our society. Several early school leavers and stay-ins indicated some adjustment difficulties in transfering from one school to another. This, obviously, puts excessive stresses and strains on the adolescents at some critical periods, particularly during puberty. In view of this, particular attention should be paid to the transient student in order that such a student is provided the needed emotional support.

3. Examination of the interview data revealed inadequate teacher-pupil relationships. Methods of improving these relationships needs to be considered. Good teachers, with proper equipment and teaching aids should be able to deal successfully with all types of students. Students who cannot be dealt with effectively are those students suffering from emotional disturbances. Such students may require the help of a counsellor/psychologist and/or doctor. Children

suffering from serious physical defects can often be accommodated adequately in special schools. Excluding the above type of students, teachers can do a great deal to improve the learning environment for students. The classroom is a place of learning, and as such it should provide an environment that constructively and humanistically promotes learning. For this to happen, educators need to be highly sensitive to the students' world. Students' feelings, emotions and experiences are an integral part of their developmental progression.

4. Many early school leavers and stay-ins reported having academic difficulties in their school experiences. Consideration should be given for the provision of individual assistance to potential dropouts. For those individuals who experience serious academic difficulties there should be available some form of services that such individuals may utilize. One of these services may be in the form of tutoring, whereby individual assistance in a secure environment can be provided. The request for individual assistance was frequently mentioned by the subjects interviewed in this study.

In addition to the provision of assistance with academic difficulties, it is deemed advantageous to provide assistance with personal difficulties. This assistance may take the form of guidance and counselling services. Early school leavers appear to display numerous adjustment and decision-making difficulties which could be alleviated through the provision of effective guidance and counselling services. It is recommended that proactive rather than a reactive approach be adopted and that identification and intervention of psycho-educational nature be implemented in the early elementary school grades.

5. Consideration might be devoted to the attainment of greater parental involvement in public education. In order to alleviate the lack of support expressed by teachers, parental involvement in the educational pursuits of their children could provide school personnel with the extra resources so that the students' academic and emotional needs are more adequately met. Particular emphasis might be given to the involvement of lower socio-economic level parents, whose children frequently experience difficulties in their academic attainment.

6. In order to capitalize on the expressed desire of many of the early school leavers to return to school, several approaches might be considered.

(a) Initiate a system whereby a regular contact by school personnel, preferably someone who has good rapport and mutual trust with early school leavers, is maintained with the early school leavers from each school. These contacts might facilitate the course of re-entry into the school.

(b) Individuals who return to school after being away for a year or longer and have worked at a job during that time may have developed a new sense of responsibility and might have begun to value education. Therefore, it is essential that these individuals be treated somewhat differently to regular students in terms of academic activities and social and personal interactions.

7. Many early school leavers and stay-ins reported to have academic problems. This is further confirmed by the finding that many leavers and stay-ins had failed at least one grade and therefore were behind their age-mate peers in school progress. Due to these findings more

serious attention should be given to general philosophical issues of continuous progress and individualized instruction as well as specific identification of under achievement and remediation in the early elementary grades. It is recommended that for identification and diagnostic purposes, valid and reliable standardized tests should be administered regularly.

SELECTED REFERENCES

SELECTED REFERENCES

Ahrendt, K. M. Reading ability and the potential dropout. Education Canada, 1970, 10, 13-15.

Anderson, C. S. The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 1982, 52(3), 368-420.

Anderson, G. J. Effects of classroom social climate on individual learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1968.

Anderson, G. J. The assessment of learning environments: a manual for the Learning Environment Inventory and the My Class Inventory. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Atlantic Institue of Education, 1973.

Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. Social Indicators of Well-being. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.

Annis, H. M., & Watson, C. Drug use and school dropout: A longitudinal study. Canadian Counsellor, 1975, 9(3-4), 155-162.

Archer, C. The process of leaving school: Characteristics and situation of non-graduates. Toronto, Ontario: Board of Education for the Borough of York, 1978.

Bachman, J. G., Green, S., & Wirtanen, I. D. Youth in transition, Vol. III: Dropping out - problem or symptom? Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1971.

Bachman, J. G., Green, S., & Wirtanen, I. D. Dropping out is a symptom. The Education Digest, 1972, 36, 1-5.

Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M. & Johnston, J. Youth in Transition, Volume VI. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1978.

Barnes, K. E. The school dropout as a community problem. Canada's Mental Health, 1973, 21, 25-29.

Bledsoe, J. C. An investigation of six correlates of student withdrawal from high school. Journal of Educational Research, 1959, 53(1), 3-6.

Blum, R. H. & Associates. Students and drugs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969(a).

Blum, R. H. & Associates. Drugs and society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969(b).

Bowman, D. H., & Matthews, C. V. Motivations of youth for leaving school. Quincy, Illinois: University of Chicago: Quincy Youth Development Project, September, 1960. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 002 813).

Boyle, R. P. The effects of the high school on students' aspirations. American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 71, 628-639.

Bradburn, N. M., & Caplovitz, D. The Structure of Psychological Well-being. Chicogo: Aldine, 1969.

Brockman, S. M. A., & Reeves, A. W. Relationship between transiency and test achievement. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 13(4), 319-330.

Brotman, R., Silverman, I., & Suffet, F. Drug use among affluent youth. In Erick Goods (Ed.) Marihuana. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.

Buchanan, K. A. Sociopsychological climates and affect in adult education classrooms. Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Alberta, 1981.

Burt, R. S., Wiley, J. A., Minor, M. J., & Murray, J. R. Structure of well-being: form, content and stability over time. Sociological Methods and Research, 1978, 6 (February), 365-407.

Burt, R. S., Fischer, M. G., & Christman, K. P. Structures of well-being: sufficient conditions for identification as restricted covariance models. Sociological Methods and Research, 1979, 8 (August), 111-120.

Campbell, A. P., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage, 1976.

Cantril, H. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

Casella, D. A., & Shrader, D. R. Tripping with borderline dropouts. School Counselor, 1975, 23, 48-50.

Central Advisory Council for Education (England). Children and their primary schools: A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education: Volumes I and II. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Cervantes, L. F. The dropout: Causes and cures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Cipywynk, S. V., Pawlovich, W. E., & Randhawa, B. S. Early school leavers in Saskatchewan: A preliminary study. Unpublished report, Deparment of Educational Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, March, 1983.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., & Hood, A. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Combs, J., & Cooley, W W. Dropouts: In high school and after school. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5(1), 343-363.

Cook, E. S., Jr. How IQ figures in the drop-out problem. School Executive, 1954 (September), 56-57.

Delaney, J. F. That Vacant High School Seat. American School Board Journal, 1950 (November), 22-23.

Dillon, H. J. Early school leavers: A major educational problem. New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1946.

Dreeben, R. On What Is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Drummie, M. A. Research report on New Brunswick drop-outs in the academic year 1963-64. Fredericton: New Brunswick Department of Youth and Welfare, 1965.

Dumka, S. Who are the dropouts? The B. C. Teacher, 1970, 50, 23-28.

Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 1976 (Winter), 13(1), 15-30.

Friedman, N. The schools and the defeat of the child. This Magazine is About Schools, 1966, 1, 75-94.

Friesen, D. Profile of the potential dropout. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 13(4), 299-309.

Gallion J. A. A comparison of achievements, attendance, dropouts, attitudes and critical thinking in a fexible, modular school and a traditional school. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37(4-a), p. 1907.

Gerson, E. M. On "quality of life." American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 793-806.

Goodman, P. The universal trap. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Profile of a school dropout: A reader on America's major educational problem. New York: Random House, 1967.

Green, B. I. Preventing school dropouts. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Griffin, C. P. Alienation of students from authority. School Guidance Worker, 1973, 28, 9-12.

Guest, H. H. A Study of Student Withdrawals from Schools in the Winnipeg School Division, No. 1. Unpublished manuscript, 1968.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic book , 1960.

Halpin, A. H. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Mcmillan Co., 1966.

Halpin, A. H., & Croft, D. B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, University of Chicago, 1963.

Hammer, E. F. (Ed.) Antiachievement: Perspectives on school dropouts. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1970.

Hammontree, T. Profile of a dropout. Florida Vocational Journal. April 1978, 26-28.

Harkins, T. W. Some variables influencing the rate of secondary school dropouts in Renfrew County, 1971-76. Ontario, 1977.

Hauser, R. School and the stratification process. American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74, 587-611.

Hewitt, J. D., & Johnson, W. S. Dropping out in "Middletown." The High School Journal, 1979, 62(4), 252-255.

Hohol, A. E. Factors associated with school drop-outs. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 1(1), 7-17.

Holdaway, E. A. Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly. 1978, 14(1), 30-47.

Hull, C. H., & Nie, N. H. SPSS Update 7-9. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Husen, T. International Study of Achievement in Mathematics. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967.

Insel, P. M., & Moos, R. H. Psychological environments: expanding the scope of human ecology. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 179-188.

Jackson, P. W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc., 1968.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., & Gintes, H. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1972.

Kaplan, J. L., & Luck, E. C. The dropout phenomenon as a social problem. The Educational Forum, 1977 (November), 41-56.

Kelley, E. Improving School Climate. Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1980.

Kelly, F. J., North J. &, Zingle, H. The relation of broken homes to subsequent school behaviors. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 11(4), 215-219.

Knudsen, D. D. An investigation of the social and familial relationships

in the life of the high school dropout. Unpublished dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1964.

Kumar, R. C., Padro, S., & Watson, C. Forecasting Note III - Estimating the number of secondary school dropouts from a local school system. Educational Planning, 1977, 4(3), 44-59.

Land, K. C. & Spilerman, S. (Eds.). Social Indicator Models. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1975.

Langner, T. S. A twenty-two item screening score of psychiatric symptoms indicating impariment. Journal of Health and Human Behaviour, 1962, 3, 269-276.

Lanier, J. A. A Guidance-Faculty Study of Student Withdrawals. Journal of Educational Research, 1949, XLIII, 14-16.

Larson, H. L. The five school project dropout study. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1958, 4(4), 212-215.

Larter, S., & Eason, G. The 'leaving school early' students: characteristics and opinions. Toronto, Ontario: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1978.

Lichter, S. O., Rapien, E. B., Siebert, F., & Sklansky, M. A. The Dropouts. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Livingston, A. High school graduates and dropouts - a new look at a persistent problem. The School Review, 1958, LXVI, 195-203.

Loevinger, J, Gleser, G. C., & DuBois, P. H. Maximizing the Discriminating Power of Multiple-Score Tests, Psychometrika, 18(4), December, 1953.

Loken, J. Patterns of drug misuse and the school dropouts. Canadian Counsellor, 1973, 7(4), 279-282.

Mayeske, G. W., Wisler, C. E., Beaton, A. E., Jr., Wenfeld, F. D., Cohen, W. M., Okada, T., Proshek, J. M., & Tabler, K. A. A study of our nation's schools. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

McCutcheon, W. W. Assessments of children from broken homes. Ontario Education, 1976, 8(1), 21-23.

McDill, E. L., & Coleman, J. S. Family and peer influences in college plans of high school students. Sociology of Education, 1965, 38 (Winter), 112-126.

McDill, E. L., Meyers, E. D., Jr., & Rigsby, L. C. Institutional effects on the academic behavior of high school students. Sociology of Education, 1967, 60 (Summer), 181-199.

Michael, J. A. High school climates and plans for entering college. The

Public Opionon Quarterly, 1961, 25 (Winter), 585-595.

Mikalechki, A. Youth alienation and the school system. Orbit, 1973, 4, 18-19.

Moos, R. Toward a typology of classroom social environments. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 53-60.

Moos, R. H. Conceptualizations of human environments. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 652-665.

Moos, R. H., & Trickett, E. J. The manual for the Classroom Environment Scale. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1974.

Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Myer, J. W. High school effects on college intentions. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 76 (July), 59-70.

Nachman, L. R., Getson, R. F., & Odger, J. G. Ohio study of high-school dropouts 1962-63. State Department of Education, 1964.

Nachman, L. R., Getson, R. F., & Odger, J. G. Pilot Study of Ohio High School Dropouts, 1961-62. Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education, 1965.

Nelson, J. I. High school context and college plans: The impact of social structure on aspirations. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37 (April), 143-148.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

O'Neill, G. P. Post-secondary aspirations of high school seniors in different school contexts: A Canadian study. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1978, 24(3), 137-155.

Otto, L. & Featherman, D. L. Social structural and psychological antecedents of self-estrangement and powerlessness. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40 (December), 701-719.

Pace, C., Stern, R. & George, G. An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49(5), 269-277.

Peebles, D. Dropping out: A review of research and literature. Toronto, Ontario: North York Board of Education, 1973.

Penningroth, M. P. A study of selected characteristics of disabled readers in the ninth grade of a large urban population in Georgia. In Schreiber, Dropout - Causes and Consequences. Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1963.

Penty, R. C. Reading ability and high school dropouts. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Rancier, G. J. Case studies of high school drop-outs. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 9(3), 13-21.

Reich, C. & Young, V. Patterns of Dropping Out. Interchange. 1975, 6, 6-15.

Richter, J. & Scandrette, O. Relationships between teacher personality ratings and student academic success. The Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 65(3), 127-131.

Robins, L. N., Darvish, H. S., & Murphy, G. E. The long-term outcome for adolescent drug users: A follow-up study of 76 users and 146 non-users. In J. Zubin and A. M. Freedman (Eds.), The Psychopathology of Adolescence. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1976.

Russell, J. Survey of drug use in selected British Columbia school districts. Vancouver: Narcotic Addiction Foundation of British Columbia, 1970.

Schreiber, D. (Ed.). Guidance and the school dropout. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Schreiber, D. (Ed.). Profile of the school dropout. New York: Vintage Press, 1967.

Schreiber, D. (Ed.). The school dropout. Washinton, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Schultz, R. A. Student affect as a function of socio-psychological climates in the classroom. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin, 1974.

Schultz, R. A. Student importance ratings as an indicator of the structure of actual and ideal sociopsychological climates. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 827-839.

Schultz, R. A. Student importance ratings as an indicator of the structure of actual and ideal sociopsycholocial climates. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1979.

Sewell, T. E., Palmo, A. J. &, Manni, J. L. High school dropout: Psychological, academic, and vocational factors. Urban Education, 1981, 16(1), 65-76.

Sharp, E. F., & Kristjanson, G. A. Manitoba high school students and dropouts. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Department of Agriculture, 1965.

Sheldon, E., & Land, K. Social reporting for the 1970's: A review and programmatic statement. Policy Sciences, 1972, 3 (Summer), 137-151.

Silberman, C. E. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Randon House, 1970.

Silberman, M. L. The Experience of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Smart, R. G., Fejer, D., & White, W. J. Trends in drug use among metropolitan Toronto high school students: 1968-1972. Addictions. 1973, 20(1), 62-72.

Spady, W., & Mitchell, D. E. The uses of authority and power in the organization and control of school task performance. Unpublished AERA symposium paper, 1971.

Stevens, J. J. The development and testing of a model for the identificaton of potential school dropouts. Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College: Dissertation Abstracts International, (University Microfilms No. 65-7734), 1965.

Stinchcombe, A. L. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

Stobo, H. A survey of high school dropouts in two schools in the Borough of York, 1971-72. Toronto, Ontario: Board of Education for the Borough of York, 1973.

Trickett, E. J., & Moos, R. H. Social environment of junior high and high schol classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65, 93-102.

Turner, R. H. The social context of ambition. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

United States Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. The Effects of Dropping Out. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

University of Alberta. Cluster analysis. Edmonton: Division of Educational Research Services, Computer Program Documentation, 1969.

Voss, H. L., Wendling, A., & Elliott, D. S. Some types of high school dropouts. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 363-368.

Walberg, H. J. Structural and affective aspects of classroom climates. Psychology in the Schools, 1968a, 5, 163-169.

Walberg, H. J. Teacher personality and classroom climate. Psychology in the Schools, 1968b, 5, 163-169.

Walberg, H. J. & Ahlgren, A. Predictors of the social environment of learning. American Educational Research Journal, 1970, 7, 153-166.

Walberg, H. J. & Anderson, G. J. Classroom climate and individual learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 414-419.

Watson, C. Focus on dropouts. An abridged version of the report of the Ontario Secondary School Dropout Study, 1974-75. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975.

Weber, L. The English infant school and informal education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Whiteside, M. & Merriman, G. Dropouts look at their teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57, 701-702.

Whitmore, P. M., & Chapman, P. W. Dropout incidence and significance at Modesto High Schools. In Schreiber, Dropout - Causes and Consequences. Modesto, California: 1964-65.

Wiener, R. S. P. Drugs and school children. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1970.

Williams, T., & Batten, M. The Quality of School Life. Hawthorn, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research Limited, July, 1981.

Williams, T. H. Educational aspirations: Longitudinal evidence on their development in Canadian youth. Sociology of Education, 1972, 45 (Spring), 107-133.

Wilson, A. B. Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys. American Sociological Review, 1959, 28 (December), 836-845.

Woolatt, H. Why capable students drop out of high schol. Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1961, 1-8.

Wright, E., Hindle, L., & Goldstein, R. A survey of 1971-72 drop-outs in a secondary school. Toronto, Ontario: Board of Education for the Borough of North York, 1973.

Zamanzadeh, D. Dropout Syndromes: A Study of Individual, Family and Social Factors in Two Montreal High Schools. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Psychiatry, McGill University, 1975.

Zamanzadeh, D., & Prince, R. Dropout syndromes: A study of individual, family, and social foactors in two Montreal high schools. McGill Journal of Education, 1978, 12(3), 301-318.

Zeller, R. Lowering the Odds on School Dropouts. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT SURVEY FORM (FORM A)

STUDENT SURVEY FORM (Form A)

Bikkar S. Randhawa, Ph.D.
Sonia V. Cipywnyk, M.Phil.
Walter E. Pawlovich, M.Ed.
University of Saskatchewan

The Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and the Department of Education want to understand the reasons for young people, like yourself, leaving school. Your help is needed to understand this matter. If we find out that some changes in schools can be helpful, other students might benefit in the future.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and you will not be named in any report that we will prepare. This survey form consists of two parts, A and B. Read carefully directions for each part before you respond to the information in that part. Please remember that this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We strongly urge you to give a frank and honest response to each item. *The answers you give are confidential.*

PART A

Please check (√) or write the information requested in this part.

			Canada	**Other**
1. Place of birth of:	a)	Mother	_____	_____
	b)	Father	_____	_____

			Elementary School	**High School**	**College/ University**
2. Level of education of:	a)	Mother	_____	_____	_____
	b)	Father	_____	_____	_____
3. Present job of:	a)	Mother	_____		
(Please write in the job)	b)	Father	_____		
4. Income of:	a)	Mother	$ _____ .00		
	b)	Father	$ _____ .00		

			Older	**Younger**
5. Number of: (Write the number under each)	a)	Brothers	_____	_____
	b)	Sisters	_____	_____

6. Level of education of each of your older brother(s)/sister(s):

(No more than six from oldest to youngest but older than you.)	**Elementary School**	**High School**	**College/ University**
i) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____
ii) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____
iii) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____
iv) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____
v) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____
vi) Brother _____ or Sister _____	_____	_____	_____

For the items 7 to 14 check *Yes* or *No*

	Yes	**No**
7. In general, would you say your reasons for leaving school were mainly:		
a) economic	_____	_____
b) personal	_____	_____
c) School-related	_____	_____

		Yes	No
8. Are you currently:			
	a) living at home	___	___
	b) employed full time	___	___
	c) working part time	___	___
	d) taking school courses	___	___
	e) enrolled in a training course	___	___
9. Do you intend to return to school:			
	a) full time	___	___
	b) part time	___	___
10. Would you have stayed in school if transfer to another school had been possible?		___	___
11. One of the reasons I left school is because I had a reading problem.		___	___
12. I left school because I was in trouble with the principal and teachers.		___	___
13. I left school because I had been suspended.		___	___
14. I left school because I had been expelled.		___	___

PART B

For the statements in this part, decide whether you Strongly Agree, Mostly Agree, Mostly Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. Please read each statement carefully and check (√) the category which best describes how *you* felt at school or why you left.

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I felt happy at school.	___	___	___	___
2. My desire for more spending money made me leave school.	___	___	___	___
3. I felt I was a reliable person at school	___	___	___	___
4. Illness in my family made me leave school.	___	___	___	___
5. At school I liked to do extra work in the subjects that interested me.	___	___	___	___
6. I had to leave school because I had left home.	___	___	___	___
7. Teachers discouraged me from expressing my opinions.	___	___	___	___
8. I did not like the school rules and regulations, so I left.	___	___	___	___
9. At school people looked up to me.	___	___	___	___
10. I quit school because my friends had left.	___	___	___	___
11. I felt depressed at school.	___	___	___	___
12. I left school because I felt I was wasting my time.	___	___	___	___
13. At school other students rejected me as I was.	___	___	___	___
14. I left school because what I was learning was not relevant to my choice of career.	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. At school I did not talk to teachers about the way they marked my work.	___	___	___	___
16. I got a job offer so I quit school.	___	___	___	___
17. My teachers treated all students equally.	___	___	___	___
18. Since my school attendance was poor, I was forced to leave.	___	___	___	___
19. At school I learnt to see other people's point of view.	___	___	___	___
20. I wanted to look for a job, and to go to work, so I left school.	___	___	___	___
21. Teachers took a personal interest in helping me with my schoolwork.	___	___	___	___
22. I left school because I was suspended or expelled.	___	___	___	___
23. At school people lacked confidence in me.	___	___	___	___
24. I quit school to support myself.	___	___	___	___
25. I felt lonely at school.	___	___	___	___
26. Since I was experiencing academic difficulties I left school.	___	___	___	___
27. I learnt a lot about myself at school.	___	___	___	___
28. I left school because of home responsibilities.	___	___	___	___
29. At school I knew I could do well enough to be successful.	___	___	___	___
30. My dissatisfaction with the school program was the reason for my leaving school.	___	___	___	___
31. My teachers treated me unfairly in class.	___	___	___	___
32. I quit school because I wanted more freedom.	___	___	___	___
33. At school other students ignored what I said.	___	___	___	___
34. I was dissatisfied with the teachers and the teaching so I quit.	___	___	___	___
35. People knew they could not depend on me at school.	___	___	___	___
36. I left school to get married.	___	___	___	___
37. I felt great at school.	___	___	___	___
38. I left school to earn money my family needed.	___	___	___	___
39. When I mixed with other people at school this helped me to understand myself.	___	___	___	___
40. Since I had a reading difficulty, I quit school.	___	___	___	___
41. At school I learnt whatever I needed to know.	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
42. Personal problems (e.g. worries) were the reason for me quitting school.	___	___	___	___
43. Teachers I had were fair and just.	___	___	___	___
44. I did not get along with the staff so I quit school.	___	___	___	___
45. At school I was treated with respect.	___	___	___	___
46. I left school because I wanted to travel.	___	___	___	___
47. I felt confident at school.	___	___	___	___
48. I left school to assist in a family business.	___	___	___	___
49. At school I never knew the sorts of things I could do well.	___	___	___	___
50. I left school because of personal illness.	___	___	___	___
51. I wasn't getting along at home, so I quit school.	___	___	___	___
52. I am happy that I left school.	___	___	___	___
53. I would not have stayed in school even if my time table had been changed.	___	___	___	___
54. The guidance counsellor was helpful when I raised the question of leaving school. (N.B. Answer this item only if your school had a guidance counsellor.)	___	___	___	___
55. The principal was not helpful when I raised the question of leaving school.	___	___	___	___
56. My mother supported my decision about leaving school.	___	___	___	___
57. I thought for a long time before I left school.	___	___	___	___
58. My father did not support my decision about leaving school.	___	___	___	___
59. My friends supported me when I decided to leave school.	___	___	___	___

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY FORM (FORM B)

STUDENT SURVEY FORM (Form B)

Bikkar S. Randhawa, Ph.D.
Sonia V. Cipywnyk, M. Phil.
Walter E. Pawlovich, M.Ed.
University of Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and the Department of Education want to understand the reasons for young people, like yourself, leaving school. Your help is needed to understand this matter. If we find out that some changes in schools can be helpful, other students might benefit in the future.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and you will not be named in any report that we will prepare. This survey form consists of two parts, A and B. Read carefully directions for each part before you respond to the information in that part. Please remember that this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We strongly urge you to give a frank and honest response to each item. The answers you give are confidential.

PART A

Please check ( ) or write the information requested in this part.

			Canada	Other
1.	Place of birth of:	a) Mother	.....	.....
		b) Father	.....	.....

			Elementary School	High School	College/ University
2.	Level of education of:	a) Mother	.....	.....	.....
		b) Father	.....	.....	.....

3.	Present job of:	a) Mother	.....
	(Please write in the job)	b) Father	.....
4.	Income of:	a) Mother	$ ..... .00
		b) Father	$ ..... .00

			Older	Younger
5.	Number of: (Write the number under each)	a) Brothers	.....	.....
		b) Sisters	.....	.....

6. Level of education of each of your older brother(s)/sister(s):

(No more than six from oldest to youngest but older than you.)	Elementary School	High School	College/ University
i) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....
ii) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....
iii) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....
iv) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....
v) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....
vi) Brother ... or Sister ...	.....	.....	.....

For the items 7 to 14 check Yes or No.		Yes	No
7. In general, would you say your reasons for leaving school were mainly:	a) economic	.....	.....
	b) personal	.....	.....
	c) School-related	.....	.....
8. Are you currently:	a) living at home	.....	.....
	b) employed full time	.....	.....
	c) working part time	.....	.....
	d) taking school courses	.....	.....
	e) enrolled in a training course.	.....	.....
9. Do you intend to return to school:	a) full time	.....	.....
	b) part time	.....	.....
10. Would you have stayed in school if transfer to another school had been possible?		.....	.....
11. One of the reasons I left school is because I had a reading problem.		.....	.....

12. I left school because I was in trouble with the principal and teachers. ....

13. I left school because I had been suspended. ....

14. I left school because I had been expelled. ....

PART B

For the statements in this part, decide whether you Strongly Agree, Mostly Agree, Mostly Di: rre, or Strongly Disagree. Please read each statement carefully and check ( ) the category which best describes how you felt at school or why you left.

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. At school I felt good about things.	-	-	-	-
2. My desire for more spending money made me leave school.	-	-	-	-
3. I acted in a responsible way at school.	-	-	-	-
4. Illness in my family made me leave school.	-	-	-	-
5. At school I did not learn how to find whatever information I needed.	-	-	-	-
6. I had to leave school because I had left home.	-	-	-	-
7. Teachers helped me to do my best.	-	-	-	-
8. I did not like the school rules and regulations, so I left.	-	-	-	-
9. At school people came to me for help.	-	-	-	-
10. I quit school because my friends had left.	-	-	-	-

11. I felt restless at school.	-	-	-	-
12. I left school because I felt I was wasting my time.	-	-	-	-
13. At school I did not get to know myself better.	-	-	-	-
14. I left school because what I was learning was not relevant to my choice of career.	-	-	-	-
15. At school I did not learn what I needed to get by in life.	-	-	-	-
16. I got a job offer so I quit.	-	-	-	-
17. My teachers did not give me the marks I deserved.	-	-	-	-
18. Since my school attendance was poor, I was forced to leave.	-	-	-	-
19. At school I did not learn to get along with other people.	-	-	-	-
20. I wanted to look for a job, and to go to work, so I left school.	-	-	-	-
21. Teachers were disinterested in what I did.	-	-	-	-
22. I left school because I was suspended or expelled.	-	-	-	-
23. At school I was thought of as a person who mattered.	-	-	-	-
24. I wasn't getting along at home, so I quit school.	-	-	-	-
25. I felt bored at school.	-	-	-	-
26. I quit school to support myself.	-	-	-	-
27. I felt ashamed to be a student.	-	-	-	-

28. Since I was experiencing academic difficulties I left school.	-	-	-	-
29. At school I knew I could reach a satisfactory standard in my work.	-	-	-	-
30. I left school because of home responsibilities.	-	-	-	-
31. My teachers ignored any extra effort I made in my work.	-	-	-	-
32. My dissatisfaction with the school program was the reason for my leaving school.	-	-	-	-
33. I was known by a lot of people at school.	-	-	-	-
34. I quit school because I wanted more freedom.	-	-	-	-
35. I knew that people at school did not think a lot of me.	-	-	-	-
36. I was dissatisfied with the teachers and the teaching so I quit.	-	-	-	-
37. I got enjoyment from being at school.	-	-	-	-
38. I left school to get married.	-	-	-	-
39. I knew what my strengths and weaknesses were at school.	-	-	-	-
40. I left school to earn money my family needed.	-	-	-	-
41. At schooI I learnt things that were useless to me.	-	-	-	-
42. Since I had a reading difficulty, I quit school.	-	-	-	-

43. Teachers were friendly to me in the classroom.	-	-	-	-
44. Personal problems (e.g. worries) were the reason for me quitting school	-	-	-	-
45. At school I was not trusted to work on my own.	-	-	-	-
46. I did not get along with the staff so I quit school	-	-	-	-
47. I got upset at school.	-	-	-	-
48. I left school because I wanted to travel.	-	-	-	-
49. At school learning was hard for me.	-	-	-	-
50. I left school to assist in a family business.	-	-	-	-
51. I left school because of personal illness.	-	-	-	-
52. I am happy that I left school.	-	-	-	-
53. I would not have stayed in school even if my time table had been changed.	-	-	-	-
54. The guidance counsellor was helpful when I raised the question of leaving school. [N.B. Answer this only if your school had a guidance counsellor.]	-	-	-	-
55. The principal was not helpful when I raised the question of leaving school.	-	-	-	-
56. My mother supported my decision about leaving school.	-	-	-	-
57. I thought for a long time before I left school.	-	-	-	-

58. My father did not support my decision about leaving school.	-	-	-	-
59. My friends supported me when I decided to leave school.	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX C

STUDENTS IN SCHOOL SURVEY FORM

(FORM A)

STUDENTS IN SCHOOL SURVEY FORM (Form A)

Bikkar S. Randhawa, Ph.D.
Sonia V. Cipywnyk, M. Phil.
Walter E. Pawlovich, M.Ed.
University of Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and the Department of Education want to understand the reasons for young people, like yourself, leaving school. Your help is needed to understand this matter. If we find out that some changes in schools can be helpful, other students might benefit in the future.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and you will not be named in any report that we will prepare. This survey form consists of two parts, A and B. Read carefully directions for each part before you respond to the information in that part. Please remember that this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. We strongly urge you to give a frank and honest response to each item. The answers you give are confidential.

PART A

For the statements in this part, decide whether you Strongly Agree, Mostly Agree, Mostly Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. Please read each statement carefully and check (✓) the category which best describes how you felt at school or why you left.

		Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I am happy at school.	-	-	-	-
2.	I feel I am a reliable person at school.	-	-	-	-
3.	At school I like to do extra work in the subjects that interest me.	-	-	-	-
4.	Teachers discourage me from expressing my opinions.	-	-	-	-

5. At school people look up to me.	-	-	-	-
6. I feel depressed at school. felt I was wasting my time.	-	-	-	-
7. At school other students reject me as I am.	-	-	-	-
8. At school I do not talk to teachers about the way they mark my work.	-	-	-	-
9. My teachers treat all students equally.	-	-	-	-
10. At school I learn to see other people's point of view.	-	-	-	-
11. Teachers take a personal interest in helping me with my schoolwork.	-	-	-	-
12. At school people lack confidence in me.	-	-	-	-
13. I feel lonely at school. left school.	-	-	-	-
14. I learn a lot about myself at school.	-	-	-	-
15. At school I know I can do well enough to be successful.	-	-	-	-
16. My teachers treat me unfairly in class.	-	-	-	-
17. At school other students ignore what I say.	-	-	-	-
18. People know they cannot depend on me at school.	-	-	-	-
19. I feel great at school.	-	-	-	-
20. When I mix with other people at school this helps me to understand myself.	-	-	-	-

3

21. At school I learn whatever I need to know.	-	-	-	-
22. Teachers I have are fair and just.	-	-	-	-
23. At school I am treated with respect.	-	-	-	-
24. I feel confident at school.	-	-	-	-
25. At school I never know the sorts of things I can do well.	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX D

STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE No. _____

NAME _____ SEX ___ DATE _____

ADDRESS _____ INTERVIEWER _____

I'd like to begin by thanking you for allowing me to talk to you for a few minutes. The interview will take about 45 minutes. We are interested in learning what early school leavers, such as yourself, have been doing since you left school, and also about your attitude towards school. I would like to assure you that anything you say will be held in strictest confidence, and that the report to come out of this research will not identify anyone by name. Also, it is your own personal experience in which we are most interested, not in what you may feel a researcher in school would like to hear. (Optional - I am going to be taking notes, so there may be some pauses between questions.)

I'd like to begin by asking you a few factual questions.

(A) Age _____ Date left school _____
Month Year

Mother's/Father's occupation (Mo.) _____ (Fa.) _____

Mother's/Father's education (Mo.) _____ (Fa.) _____

No. of bros./sisters _____ Do they go to school? _____ Grs.? _____

If out of school, how far did they go?

What are they doing now? (Occupation)

1. 5.

2. 6.

3. 7.

4. 8.

English Mother tongue (?) _____ Other languages (?) _____

Born in Canada (?) _____ Where(?) Place or country _____

Parents' place of birth _____

Other relatives living at home? _____

Schools attended _____ How long? (grades, etc.)

1. 5.

2. 6.

3. 7.

4. 8.

(B) Now I'd like you to think back to the time that you were in school. (Throughout - check for difference between high school/public school experience.)

1. a) How, generally, did you get along with the teachers you had at school? (exceptions?)

_____

b) Were there teachers that you particularly liked? _____

(repeat for dislike?) _____

(What about them did you like?) _____

_____

c) Did you ever talk to any of your teachers about personal concerns?

_____ Would you have liked to? _____

d) Were there subjects at school that you particularly liked? _____

What Subjects?_____ Why? _____

_____

Disliked? _____ What subjects? _____

Why? _____

2. While at school, did you have any particular problems doing the work asked of you? _____ How did you handle these problems? _____

_____

3. a) How, generally, did you get along with your fellow students?

_____

b) Did you see your classmates after school or hang around with them?

_____ How did you spend your time after school? _____

_____

3. c) Did you have much to do with your principal, vice-principal: _____

About what - other? (Probe) _____

d) Did you participate in any extra-curricular activities while at school? _____ (Other organizations, clubs) Please explain?

_____

_____

e) Did you fail any grades? Yes ____ No ____ Which grades? _____

_____ Reasons _____

_____

f) Were you ever suspended from school? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, why and reasons. _____

_____

g) Did you have learning difficulties? Yes ____ No ____. If yes, please explain? _____

_____

4. a) Did you ever skip classes when at school? ____ How often? _____

Average/week (day) _____ Particular subjects? _____

b) When did you begin doing this? _____

c) Did you generally do your homework when it was assigned? _____

If no, when did this begin? _____

5. a) How would you describe your attitude towards school while you were there? (probe for <u>likes</u>/<u>dislikes</u> about school in general.)

_____

_____

b) How long did you feel this way? _____

c) Was there a time when you felt differently? (probe for time of change and feelings toward school) _____

_____

6. a) Was your decision to leave school made on the spur of the moment or was it made after a lot of thought? (Probe for reasons for leaving (financial, family, friends - sources of influence.)

_____

_____

_____

b) Did you really want to leave school? _____

c) What made you decide to leave school when you did? _____

_____

d) Was leaving school your own idea? (If no) Whose idea was it?

_____ (If yes) Who agreed with it? _____

(C) 7. While at school, did you discuss your school work with your parents?

_____ How often? _____ Circumstances? _____

_____

8. How would you describe your parents attitude toward school while you were going there?

_____

9. a) Did your parents ever visit your school? _____

b) Under what circumstances? _____

_____

10. What was their response to your decision to leave school? _____

_____

11. Do you think dropping out was the best thing you could have done at the time? _____

(If yes) In what way? _____

(If no) Why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

12. Did you speak to a guidance counsellor about dropping out? _____

a) (If yes) What did they say about it? _____

_____

b) (If no) Why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Did you speak to any of your teachers about dropping out?

a) (If yes) What did they say about it? _____

_____

b) (If no) Why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

14. Did you speak to your principal or vice-principal about dropping out?

a) (If yes) What did they say about it? _____

_____

b) (If no) Why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

15. Did you talk to your friends about dropping out?

a) (If yes) What did they say about it? _____

_____

b) (If no) Why not? _____

_____

16. When you dropped out did you know what you were going to do instead of going to school?

    a) (If yes) What were you going to do? _____

    b) (If no) Was there any reason for that? _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

17. When you dropped out did you intend to go back to school some day? ____

18. Is there anything that could have been done to pursuade you to stay in school? _____

    a) (If yes) What? _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

19. At what age do you think students should be allowed to leave school?

    _____ Why? _____

D. The next few questions have to do with what you've been doing since you first left school.

20. First I'd like to know if you had a job while you were in school? ____

    (If yes, what kind - if left, why?) _____

    _____

21. Next, we're interested in knowing what you've been doing since you left school. What jobs did you have since you left, etc.? (Get an accounting of jobs, times of unemployment, return to school (if any), if left job - why? Length of time in jobs.

    _____

    _____

    _____

22. a) In general, how satisfactory have you found your work experience? (Probe for days missed/late, etc.)

_____

What do you like/dislike about working? _____

_____

b) How do you get along with your fellow workers? _____

c) Boss(es)? _____

d) (If working) Do you plan to stay in this job? ___ How long? _____ Have you given any thought to a career? _____

Future plans, if any. _____

_____

_____

e) (If not working) What future plans do you have? _____

_____

23. What contact have you had with the school system since you stopped attending school? _____

E. 24. How would you describe your attitude towards school at the present time? _____

25. If you had the decision to leave to make over again, do you think you would do the same thing? (yes/no - why?) _____

_____

26. Do you think now, that it was a good idea for you to leave school as early as you did? (Regrets?)

_____

27. Have you ever recommended to someone else that they leave school as early as you did? _____

If no, would you? _____

If yes, did they do it? _____

28. Do you have any plans to go back to school or to continue your education in some other form?

_____

F. 29. a) How would you describe your relationship with your family at the present time?

Parents _____

Brothers and sisters _____

b) Do you think the fact that you are (no longer) attending school has changed your relationship with your family?

Parents _____

Brothers & Sisters _____

In what way? _____

30. Do you think your parents would like you to (go back to school) take something in particular?

_____

31. Do you have the same friends now as you had while in school? _____

Are they going to school? _____

What is their attitude towards school? _____

32. a) Do you think that the school system should do more than it is now with students who want to leave school early? _____

What? _____

_____

_____

b) Do you think that students should be allowed to leave school before the age of 16? _____

Why? _____

_____

33. In general, how has your experience at work differed from that you had at school? _____

_____

34. Those are all the questions I have to ask, do you have any further comments you would like to add?

Thank-you.

- Tell student we will be contacting their parents via telephone to ask them a few questions about the program and their point of view re: student's decision to leave school early.

APPENDIX E

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name: _____

School: _____

1. How did _____ generally get along at school?

   Generally _____

   _____

   With Teachers _____

   _____

   With Principal _____

   _____

   With Subjects _____

   _____

   With Fellow Students _____

   _____

2. Did _____ relate to anybody in the school?

   Yes _____ No _____ If yes, with whom? _____

   Circumstances? _____

   _____

3. Were there any sources of conflict or friction that you were aware of?

   _____

   _____

4. (a) Why do you think _____ dropped out of school?

   _____

   _____

   (b) What was your response to that decision? _____

   _____

   _____

5. Since _____ has left school what do you feel now about his/her decision to leave? _____

_____

6. (a) Do you see any advantage in _____ going back to school?

Yes _____ No _____. Reason: _____

_____

(b) What are the chances of this person coming back to school? _____

_____

7. What is the general attitude of teachers toward dropouts? _____

_____

_____

8. What is the general attitude of students toward dropouts? _____

_____

_____

9. (a) What are the major reasons why students drop out? _____

_____

_____

_____

(b) Why is the dropout situation a concern to you? _____

_____

_____

10. What do you think should be done about the dropout situation?

School _____

_____

_____

Parent _____

Community _____

Government _____

Other _____

APPENDIX F

PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name of Parent _____ Father/Mother

Name of Student _____

1. How did _____ generally get along at school?

   Generally _____

   with Teachers _____

   _____

   with Subjects _____

   _____

   with Fellow Students _____

   _____

   Other _____

2. What kind of contact did you have with the school while your son/daughter was at school? (teachers/principal/vice-principal/guidance counsellor, etc.)

   _____

   _____

3. How much did you discuss school with your son/daughter? _____

   Were you aware of any sources of friction or conflicts? _____

   _____

   _____

4. What was your response when your son/daughter decided to leave school early?

   _____

   _____

5. What do you think were the main reasons for your son's/daughter's leaving school?

   _____

   _____

6. Have your feelings changed at all regarding your sons/daughter leaving?

   Yes _____ No _____. If yes, how? _____

   _____

7. Do you feel that your relationship with your son/daughter has changed since he/she left school Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, in what way? _____

   _____

8. (a) Would you like to see him/her go back to school? _____

   (b) What are the chances of him/her going back to school? _____

   _____

9. What do you think of the school program and would you like to see any changes or improvements?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. Any other comments you would like to make. _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STAY-INS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STAYINS

1. How do you generally get along in school? (Probe for problems with teachers, subjects, fellow students, programs, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

2. (a) What do you like about school? _____

_____

(b) What do you dislike about school? _____

_____

3. Have you ever considered dropping out of school? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, when was that? _____

Why were you thinking of leaving? _____

Did anything in particular happen at that time? _____

_____

YES - What made you decide to stay? _____

- Who did you talk to about your wanting to leave? _____

_____

- Did you get any help or did anything change? _____

4. Do you know anyone who dropped out of school in the past year? _____

(a) Why do you think they dropped out? _____

(b) What was your response to their decision to dropout? _____

_____

(c) Since they have left school, what do you feel about their leaving now?

_____

5. (a) Would you like to see those people who dropped out go back to school?

_____ Do you think they will? _____

6. What do you think is the general attitude of teachers towards droputs?

What do you think is the general attitude of students towards dropouts?

7. Why is the dropout situation a concern to you?

8. Why do you think students drop out in general?

9. What do you think should be done about the dropout situation by:

School

Parents

Community

Government

Other

10. Those are all the questions I wanted to ask, are there any further comments that you would like to add?

APPENDIX H

TABULATED INTERVIEW RESULTS

Table H1

Month When Early School Leaver Left School

Year	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June
1980-81		3	3	3	2	4	1	3	8	8
1981-82	2	11	5	1	2	7	5	1	1	0
Total	2	14	8	4	4	11	6	4	9	8
Percent	2.9	20.0	11.4	5.7	5.7	15.7	8.6	5.7	12.9	11.4

Table H2

Occupational Status of Early School Leavers' Parents

Year	Parent	Profes-sional	White Collar	Blue Collar	Skilled	Un-skilled	House-wife	Far-mer	Total
1980-81	Mother	2	3	4	8	11	6		
	Father	2	3	6	11	6		4	
1981-82	Mother	3	5	3	6	7	10		
	Father	2	4	8	5	12		5	
Subtotal	Mother	5	8	7	14	18	16		
	Father	4	7	14	16	18		9	
Total		9	15	21	30	36	16	9	136*
Percent		6.6	11.0	15.4	22.1	26.5	11.8	6.6	

*Some single parent families, therefore only 136 parents

Table H3

Education Completed by Early School Leavers' Parents

Year	Parent	Less 8	8	9	10	11	12	Post Sec	N/A
1980-81	Mother	9	5	2	7	2	6	3	2
	Father	11	7	3	4	0	6	1	2
1981-82	Mother	11	4		4	1	7	3	4
	Father	11	4		9	3	5	1	2
Subtotal	Mother	20	9	2	11	3	13	6	6
	Father	22	11	3	13	3	11	2	4
Total		42	20	5	25	6	24	8	10
Percent		30	14.3	3.6	17.9	4.3	17.1	5.7	7.1

Note: N = 130 parents. N/A (not available) = 10 parents.
Total = 140 parents

Table H4

Early School Leavers' Family size, Position in Family and School History of Siblings

Year	Average No. of Siblings	Position				No. of ESL's with ESL Siblings	No. of ESL's with Siblings in School
		Only	Oldest	Middle	Youngest		
1980-81	3.9	1	3	10	21	18	15
1981-82	3.6	0	10	13	12	18	24
Total	3.75	1	13	23	33	36	39
Percent		1.4	18.6	32.9	47.1	51.4	55.7

Table H5

Primary Language Spoken at Early School Leaver's Home

Year	English	French
1980-81	34	1
1981-82	34	1
Total	68	2
Percent	97	3

Table H6

Birth Place of Early School Leavers
and of Early School Leavers' Parents

Year		Canada	Ger-many	Eng-land	Isle of Man	Africa	Iraq	Italy	USA
1980-81	Leavers	34					1		
	Parents	66	2						
1981-82	Leavers	33		1				1	
	Parents	63		2	1	1		2	1
Total	Leavers	67	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
	Parents	129	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
Percentage	Leavers	95.7	0	1.4	0	0	1.4	1.4	0
	Parents	92.1	1.4	1.4	0.7	0.7	1.4	1.4	0.7

Table H7

Number of Schools Attended by Early School Leavers

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
1980-81	9	7	8	3	3	3	2	
1981-82	5	5	5	7	3	6	3	1
Total	14	12	13	10	6	9	5	1
Percent	20.0	17.1	18.6	14.3	8.6	12.9	7.1	1.4

Table H8

Number of Early School Leavers Failing Grades and Reasons for Failure

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did you fail any grades?				
Yes	20	18	38	54.3
No	15	17	32	45.7
Reasons For Failure				
Neglected school work	9	5	14	
Problem getting along with teacher(s)	9	5	14	
Learning problems - subjects too difficult	9	4	13	
Adjustment problems when moving from one school to another	6	7	13	
Poor attendance	4	5	9	
Disliked school	6	2	8	
Alcohol and drugs cause of falling behind and failure	2	4	6	
Language problem	1	2	3	
Home problems - stayed home a lot because dad had an operation		1	1	
Sexually abused by a stranger and never recovered	1		1	
Lost interest in school	1		1	
Horsed around a lot, didn't take school seriously	1		1	
In foster home and felt unwanted		1	1	
Reading problems	1		1	
Immature - could not understand directions	1		1	

Table H9

Grades Failed by Early School Leavers

	Grades Failed								
	0	1-3	4	5	7	8	9	10	11
1980-81	15	2	3	1	3	2	4	4	1
1981-82	17	2		1	6		4	4	1
Total	32	4	3	2	9	2	8	8	2
Percentage	45.7	5.7	4.3	2.9	12.9	2.9	11.4	11.4	2.9

Table H10

General Progress: Relationships with Teachers, Principals/Vice-principals, Peers; and Academic Performance As Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
How did you get along in school in general?				
Good/Sastisfactory	23	22	45	64.3
Borderline/some problems	10	12	22	31.4
Poorly/many problems	2	1	3	4.3
How did you get along with teachers?				
Good	17	23	40	57.1
Borderline	14	10	24	34.3
Poor	3	2	5	7.1
Undecided			1	1.4
How did you get along with the Principal/Vice-principal?				
Good	7	14	21	30.0
Borderline	3	7	10	14.3
Poor	10	5	15	21.4
Undecided		1	1	1.4
Had little involvement with Principal/V.P.	15	8	23	32.9
How was your academic school performance?				
Good		8	8	11.4
Borderline	13	14	27	38.6
Poor	21	11	32	45.7
Had ability but did not perform well	2	1	3	4.3
How did you get along with peers?				
Good	28	30	58	82.9
Borderline	3	2	5	7.1
Poor	4	3	7	10.0

Table H11

Teacher Qualities Liked Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Teacher Qualities Liked				
Understanding & Caring	18	20	38	34.9
Assisted students when required	8	8	16	14.7
Took time to talk to you	8	7	15	13.8
Friendly & personable	4	9	13	11.9
Sense of humor	4	3	7	6.4
Just decent people	2	2	4	3.7
Treated students fairly	3	0	3	2.8
Treated students with respect	1	2	3	2.8
Genuine--talked at student level	2	1	3	2.8
Good teaching methods	2		2	1.8
Open minded & flexible	1	1	2	1.8
Always available	1		1	1.8
Gentle--not the type to jump on you--respected you	1		1	1.8
Knowledgeable	1		1	.9
Total			109	

Table H12

Teacher Qualities Disliked by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Were there teachers you disliked?				
Yes	28	29	57	81.4
No	7	6	13	18.6
Did not show any caring toward students	10	1	11	
Negative attitude toward students	7	4	11	
Never showed interest in students	5	3	8	
Hassle you — but don't help	4	4	8	
Interfere in personal matters	1	5	6	
Poor teaching	2	3	5	
Unjust treatment of students (prejudiced)		5	5	
Bad temper	2	2	4	
Put no effort into teaching	2	1	3	
Too strict		1	1	
Didn't know how to communicate		1	1	
Did you talk to teachers regarding personal concerns?				
Yes	16	13	30	42.9
No	19	21	40	57.1
Would you have liked to?				
Yes	11	12	23	57.5
No	8	9	17	42.5

Table H13

Subjects Reported Liked by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Were there subjects you liked?				
Yes	35	35	70	100.0
No				0.0
Why Liked?				
Liked content of subject matter and found it interesting	16	22	38	
I was good at them	8	9	17	
I liked the activites in them	6	9	15	
Liked teachers that taught them	7	5	12	
Useful & meaningful	3	2	5	
Easy to understand	2	2	4	
Were there subjects disliked?				
Yes	27	31	58	82.9
No	8	4	12	17.1
Why Disliked?				
Problems doing the work	15	9	24	
Problem with teachers	11	12	23	
Saw no relevance (no practicality)	7	8	15	
I didn't do well	6	2	8	
Boring (bored with subject)	2	6	8	
Didn't care for school work	1	7	8	
Everything	3		3	

Table H14

School Problems Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did you have problems with school work?				
Yes	29	16	45	64.3
No	6	19	25	35.7
How was the problem handled?				
Did nothing - didn't ask for help	9	9	18	
Asked and received teacher help	10	3	13	
Asked but didn't receive teacher help	5	4	9	
Skipped classes	3	4	7	
Asked and received help from friends & parents	2	2	4	
I would drop what I didn't like or couldn't do	4		4	
In high school I didn't care and wasn't interested in handling problems	1	2	3	
Made up excuses	2	1	3	
The subjects were too hard for me--I just gave up	3	3	3	

Table H15

Activities Shared With Peers Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did you spend time with classmates?				
Yes	29	27	56	80.0
No	6	8	14	20.0
How was the time spent?				
Alcohol/drugs	25	21	46	
Go for coffee	19	15	34	
Drive around	13	16	29	
Partied	13	9	22	
Sports Activities	7	7	14	
Just talked and visited	7	3	10	
Dating and/or meeting with opposite sex	3	3	6	
Pool hall	3	3	6	
Part-time work	2	2	4	
Shows	3		3	
Go downtown - browse	1	2	3	
Doing assignments together	1	1	2	
Pinball	2		2	
Shopping		1	1	
Go to bar	1		1	
Babysitting	1		1	

Table H16

Relationships with Administration Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did you talk with the Principal and/or Vice Principal when at school?				
Yes	15	19	34	48.6
No	20	16	36	51.4
Reasons for No				
Didn't want to bother him/her	5	10	15	
Didn't want him/her involved	7	2	9	
Not my kind of person	6	2	8	
I hated him/her	3		3	
Didn't think I could talk to him/her		1	1	
I was scared of him/her		1	1	
If Yes, what about?				
Absence and skipping classes	6	8	14	
My school progress	3	7	10	
For being in trouble	4	3	7	
Helped with my problems	4	1	5	
As a friend	3		3	
Registering & course changes	1	1	2	
School activities	1		1	
Smoking		1	1	

Table H17

Involvement in Extra Curricular Activities

as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did you participate in extra curriculuar activities?				
Yes	18	18	36	51.4
No	17	17	34	48.6
Kinds of Activities				
Sports	14	16	30	
Clubs	3	4	7	
Band and Music	3	3	6	
Drama Activities	2	2	4	
Newspaper	1		1	
Organizing Trips	1		1	
Fund Raising	1		1	
Christian Ethics		1	1	

Table H18

Reasons for Suspensions as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Were you ever suspended?				
Yes	10	7	17	24.3
No	25	28	53	75.7
Reasons for Suspension				
Skipping classes	4	2	6	
Fighting in school	2	2	4	
Disrespectful of teacher/Principal	2	2	4	
Smoking	2		2	
Drugs/alcohol	1		1	

Table H19

Learning Difficulties Experienced by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Have Learning Problems?				
Yes	11	8	19	27.1
No	24	27	51	72.9
Kinds of Learning Problems				
Subject too difficult - problems comprehending subject content	7	3	10	
Reading	1	2	3	
Problems due to poor attendance	1	1	2	
Shyness (couldn't interact)	2		2	
Didn't say		2	2	
Language problem	1		1	

Table H20

People Involved in Decision Making Regarding Early Leaving as Reported by Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Was Leaving Your Own Decision?				
Yes	1	28	59	84.3
No	4	7	11	15.7
If "no" whose idea was it?				
Parent(s)	1	2	3	
Friend(s)	1		1	
Principal		2	2	
Vice-principal	1		1	
Fiance		2	2	
Everybody - the situation demanded it		1	1	
The law (put in jail)		1	1	
Who agreed with your decision to leave?				
Parent(s)	10	11	21	30.0
Nobody agreed	12	8	20	28.6
Friend(s)	3	7	10	14.3
Principal	2	7	9	12.9
Vice Principal	3	2	5	7.1
Fiance	1	4	5	7.1
Teacher(s)	1	1	2	2.9
Everybody - the situation demanded it		1	1	1.4
The law (put in jail)		1	1	1.4
Total			74	

Note: Some individuals gave more than one response therefore percentage total does not equal 100.

Table H21

Reactions to Leaving of Early School Leavers' Parents

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Agreed	11	10	21	30.0
Said its okay if I get a job	7	8	15	
Agreed since I wasn't doing anything at school	2	1	3	
Pleased, that's what they wanted	1	1	2	
They talked to me about it, asked me if that was what I wanted	1		1	
Disagreed	10	12	22	31.4
Tried to convince me to stay	6	8	14	
Shocked, angry and upset	3	3	6	
Angry with school and teacher - felt treatment was unfair	1	1	2	
Neutral	11	8	19	27.2
Left it up to me entirely	7	2	9	
Left it up to me but wanted me to stay in school	4	6	10	
Split - one parent agreed, one parent disagreed	4	4	8	11.4
Total			70	100.0

Table H22

Attitude Towards School of Early School Leaver's Parents

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Encouraging	27	27	54	77.1
Neutral	7	6	13	18.6
Discouraging	1	2	3	4.3
Parental Involvement with School				
Attended P.T. Interviews	26	30	56	80.0
Tried to do what they could	28	27	55	78.6
Visited school when requested	25	22	47	67.1
Come to school to discuss my problems	11	9	20	28.6
Seldom visited school	7	3	10	14.3
Active in school functions	4	3	7	10.0
Never visited school		1	1	1.4

Table H23

Reflections on Leaving by Early School Leavers

Year 80/81	81/82	Total	%
Was It A Good Decision At The Time?			
Yes	24	19	43	61.4
No	9	16	25	35.7
Undecided	2		2	2.9
If "yes" how was it good?			
Got away from a situation I didn't like/do well. Relieved pressure	14	12	26	
Less hassles and worry	3	3	6	
Helped me regain my sanity - more peace of mind and self-esteem	3	2	5	
Made me more responsible for my own life - that's what I wanted	2	2	4	
Didn't have to put up with lousy subjects	2	1	3	
More freedom	3		3	
Got a job - I like it	1	1	2	
Got rid of teacher hassles	2		2	
Was able to earn more money		2	2	
Got me away from drugs	1	1	2	
I got married	1		1	
No more problems with students hassling me		1	1	
Improved my family relationships		1	1	
I got one year experience in living away from home before going to Tech		1	1	
If "no" Why not?			
Wanted or needed grade 12	4	5	9	
Don't see my friends anymore	1	4	5	
It was a waste - I could have salvaged part of the year	1	3	4	
Having difficulty in work on job	3	1	4	
Only temporary relief	2	2	4	
Wanted or needed grade 10		3	3	
I'd like more education. I value it.	2	1	3	
It's going to screw up my life		1	1	
Low paying job		1	1	

Table H24

Early School Leavers' Consultation With Counsellor Regarding Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Consult With A Counsellor Prior to Leaving?				
Yes	9	8	17	24.3
No	13	15	28	40.0
*No counselling available	13	12	25	35.7
If "yes" what was said?				
Encouraged to stay	5	2	7	
Weighed pros & cons (neutral)	3	2	5	
Encouraged to leave		3	3	
Helped me plan my future	1	1	2	
If "no" why not?				
Didn't care to involve them	7	6	13	
Didn't think it would be helpful	1	3	4	
Didn't even think of it	1	2	3	
Didn't know him very well	1		2	
Scared to talk to him	1	1	2	
I make my own decisions		2	2	
It was clear what I had to do	2		2	
Didn't have time		1	1	
No reason		1	1	

*No counsellor in two of the six schools

Table H25

Early School Leavers Consultation With Teachers Regarding Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Consult Any Teachers?				
Yes	4	9	13	18.6
No	31	26	57	81.4
If "yes" what was said?				
Discouraged to leave		5	5	
Encouraged to leave	1	3	4	
Neutral, said it's your decision	1	1	2	
Helped me work out a plan	1	1	2	
If "no" why not?				
Felt it wasn't their concern - didn't want to involve them	19	21	40	
It wouldn't have changed anything	4	2	6	
No way - not my kind of people	5		5	
Talked to somebody else	2	1	3	
No time		3	3	
Didn't think they cared	3		3	
Scared of teachers	1	1	2	
I made up my mind	1	1	2	

Table H26

Early School Leavers' Consultation With Vice Principal Regarding Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Talk With A Vice Principal?				
Yes	6	13	19	31.7
No	29	22	41	68.3
If "yes" what was said?				
Discouraged to drop	3	6	9	
Encouraged to drop	1	3	4	
Neutral - it's your decision		4	4	
Made no comment - not interested	1	1	2	
If "no" why not?				
Didn't want to involve them--not the kind of person I could talk to	14	11	25	
I make my own decisions	7	1	8	
Nothing would have changed	2	1	3	
They would try to talk me out of it	2		2	
Already talked to someone	1	1	2	
No time		2	2	
Didn't get along with V.P.		2	2	
There was no reason to--no concern shown in the past		1	1	

Table H27

Early School Leavers' Consultation With Principal Regarding Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Speak With Principal?				
Yes	13	8	21	30.0
No	22	27	49	70.0
If "yes" what was said?				
Shape up or quit	5	1	7	
Discouraged to drop	3	3	6	
Encouraged to drop	3	1	4	
Neutral - left it to me	1	3	4	
If "no" why not?				
We didn't get along	7	5	12	
I talked with someone else	6	3	9	
What for - it wouldn't help	4	4	8	
I didn't want to	3	3	6	
I make my own decisions	3	3	6	
He would have told me what I already knew		2	2	
No time		2	2	
They would try to talk me out of it	1		1	

Table H28

Early School Leavers' Consultation With Friends Regarding Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Consult With Friend(s)				
Yes	24	25	49	70.0
No	11	10	21	30.0
If "yes" what was said?				
Discouraged to leave	10	13	23	
Neutral - we evaluated the decision & I chose	12	10	22	
Encouraged to leave	2	2	4	
If "no" why not?				
It's my decision, not their concern	7	6	13	
It wouldn't be useful	2	2	4	
Happened too quickly, no time	1	2	3	
Friends don't care	1		1	

Table H29

Early School Leavers' Opinions Regarding Early School Leaving Age

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Should Students Be Allowed To Leave Before Age 16?				
Yes	4	7	11	15.7
No	31	28	59	84.3
If "yes", why?				
If not learning, let them leave	3	2	5	
They should be able to leave if they have something to go to	1	4	5	
Let them go if they want to		1	1	
If "no", why not?				
Not old enough to make own decision	20	15	35	
Everyone should try to get grade 12	6	8	14	
Because they can get a better job with more education	5	1	6	
Should get at least grade 10		2	2	
It's okay as it is now		2	2	

Table H30

Early School Leavers' Employment History While at School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Did You Have A Part-time Job While At School?				
Yes	25	25	50	71.4
No	10	10	20	28.6
Kind Of Job				
Unskilled labor - regular	18	21	39	
Casual - when called	5		5	
Family business or farm	2	2	4	
Skilled labor - regular		2	2	
Full-time job		1	1	

Table H31

Early School Leavers' Relationships at Workplace

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Rapport With Co-workers/Boss				
Fine (with co-workers)	31	28	59	93.6
Fine (with boss)	28	27	55	87.3
O.K. (with boss)	4	1	5	7.9
O.K. (with co-workers)	2	1	3	4.8
Poorly (with boss)	2	1	3	4.8
Poorly (with co-workers)	1		1	1.6
Do You Plan On Staying In This Job?				
Yes	26	22	48	76.2
No	8	4	12	19.0
Uncertain		3	3	4.8

Table H32

Early School Leavers' Present Attitude Toward Leaving

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Have you ever recommended that someone else leave as early as you?				
Yes		2	2	2.9
No	35	33	68	97.1
Would you recommend to anyone to leave school as early as you did?				
Yes	1	1	2	2.9
No	34	34	68	97.1
Has your relationship with parents changed?				
Yes	22	13	35	50.0
No	13	22	35	50.0
How has it changed?				
Same	13	22	35	50.0
Better	21	12	33	47.1
Worse	1	1	2	2.9
If Better, How?				
I'm closer to my parents	6	3	9	
Better communication	5	2	7	
Fighting stopped	4	2	6	
I'm more tolerant and more understanding of my parents	3	3	6	
Now I'm treated as an adult	3	3	6	
Less tension at home	3	3	6	
Do you think your parents would like you to go back to school?				
Yes	25	32	57	81.4
No	6	3	9	12.9
Do you have the same friends as you had when in school?				
Yes	25	32	57	80.0
No	9	2	11	15.7
Yes, and more friends	2	1	3	4.3

Table H33
Early School Leavers' Responses to Open-Ended Question

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Teacher Related Responses				
Teacher should spend more time with students individually.	8	5	13	
Teachers should be more caring, knowlegeable and humane.	7	4	11	
It's hard to care about school when teachers don't care about you.	3	1	4	
Teachers have poor attitude toward teaching.	1	2	3	
Basically school is okay but I'm not as interested in it as I was in Jr.High because the staff seemed to put in a better effort then. When I was in high school many teachers seemed to be on the defensive. If you don't jump or dance the way they want you to you're out.		2	2	
Teachers play God with your marks and life.		2	2	
Teachers should teach everyone on the same basis, they should not separate the bright and average.		1	1	
Teacher favoritism makes students loose motivation.		1	1	
			37	57.8
Drug and Alcohol Related Responses				
Drugs and alcohol tear your value system down and probably is related to leaving school early.	1	5	6	
Alcohol is related to people performance in and outside school and causes people to not care.	3	1	4	
Alcoholic parents cause student frustrations which are expressed in school.	1	1	2	
There is a need for drug awareness program.		2	2	
			14	21.9

Table H33 continued...

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
General Responses				
The V.P. is very judgemental, he does not listen to reasoning.	1	1	2	
GED too easy its a rip off for those who stay in school.	1	1	2	
Should have program to help integrate new Cdns.	1		1	
Some principals/teachers make sexual advances toward girls.		1	1	
I became a true Christian and this has helped me to mature and straighten myself out.		1	1	
School systems in small town settings should be particularly noticed. If a bad relationship develops with a teacher or principal, the student is doomed to failure or early leaving. It is very important that staff be communicative and cooperative.	1		1	
The V.P. is rough - no one can establish a friendship with him.	1		1	
There are fewer opportunities available to country school students.		1	1	
The attitude of students was pretty bad due to mainly the lack of attention, concern and care by the adult people around them.		1	1	
There has to be better communication between school people, students and parents. Many students just waiting to reach 16 so they can quit.		1	1	
More guidance and counselling service. Students need to talk to someone about home problems.		1	1	
13	20.3			
Total		64	100.0	

Table H34

Parents' Responses to their Children Leaving School

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
What Was Your Response When She/He Decided to Leave?				
Encouraged to stay in school	20	8	28	43.8
Neutral - we just left it up to him/her to decide	12	4	16	25.0
Disappointed but he/she was determined to leave and did		5	5	7.8
Encouraged to drop	3	2	5	7.8
Just a matter of time	3	2	5	7.8
We felt hopeless, there was no alternative but to accept it		2	2	3.1
Whatever makes him happy—own decision	1	1	2	3.1
Parental split		1	1	1.6

Table H35

Principals'/Teachers' Responses to an Individual Student's Decision to Leave

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
What Was Your Response To His/Her Decision To Leave?				
Agreed and/or encouraged to leave	19	14	33	51.6
Disagreed - discouraged to leave	6	13	19	29.7
Neutral, noncommital	5	7	12	18.7
Total			64	100.0
If not achieving, good idea to leave school and do something else	4	6	10	24.4
Incredible waste of potential	2	7	9	21.9
Could have passed grade XII with good effort but wasn't willing to make a strong effort to succeed	4	4	8	19.5
He/she couldn't handle school academically	3		3	7.3
He/she needed help, was too inadequate to find it	3		3	7.3
Lack of self discipline		3	3	7.3
Felt sad when someone with so much talent decided to quit; person was hurting & not able to resolve or cope with problems		1	2	4.9
There were no alternatives	2		2	4.9
Devoted all his/her time to sports, work, partying	1		1	2.4
Total			41	100.0

Table H36

Teachers'/Principals' Perceptions of Student Attitude Toward Early Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Don't care at all - neutral	13	10	23	35.9
See them as loser - negative	4	6	10	15.6
Only care if it's a close friend	7	2	9	14.1
Positive step for some	4	4	8	12.5
Glad to get rid of them	3	3	6	9.4
See leaving as an error	2	4	6	9.4
Ignore the situation		2	2	3.1
Total			64	100.0

Table H37

Teachers'/Principals' Perceptions of Teacher/Principal Attitude Toward Early School Leavers

Year	80/81	81/82	Total	%
Teachers do not like to see students leaving school early in general	9	10	19	27.9
Mixed feelings -- depending on student	7	4	11	16.2
Teachers try to keep students in school -- they hate to see wasted potential	3	9	12	17.6
For some there is no alternative to leaving - some just waste their time	3	6	9	13.2
For some students leaving is a positive move to activities which are more in line with their interests and capabilities	3	4	7	10.3
In some cases it's impossible to continue teaching with the negative attitude that students display. In those cases it's a positive step if they leave.	3	2	5	7.4
Neutral teachers don't care whether they leave or stay	3	1	4	5.9
Willing to take them back		1	1	1.4
Total			68	99.9

Table H38

Grade and Sex of Stay-ins

	Grade					Sex		
	8	9	10	11	12	M	F	Total
Total	1	10	28	21	1	38	23	61
%	1.6	16.4	45.9	34.4	1.6	62.3	37.7	100.0

Table H39

Stay-ins' Perception of Their General Satisfaction and Progress in School and Attitude Toward School

	Total	%
General Progress and Satisfaction with school	61	
Not satisfactory, many problems	24	39.3
Good, no problems	22	36.1
Satisfactory, some problems	13	21.3
No response	2	3.3
General Progress Regarding Subjects		
Borderline - barely passing	21	34.4
Failing most	20	32.8
Doing well - average or above	7	11.5
Adequate - below average but passing	11	18.0
No response	2	3.3
How Do You Get Along With Teachers?		
Good	27	44.3
Borderline	16	26.2
Badly	10	16.4
No response	8	13.1
How Do You Get Along With Students?		
Good	60	98.4
Badly	1	1.6

N = 61

Table H40

Stay-ins' Likes Regarding School

	Total	%
What Do You Like About School?		
Friends and socializing	40	47.6
I learn new information	11	13.1
I like most of my classes	9	10.7
Education is important	7	8.3
Nothing	6	7.1
Sports	4	4.8
I like the structure	2	2.4
I'm good at school	1	1.2
Something to do	1	1.2
Freedom to pick classes	1	1.2
Industrial arts	1	1.2
Art	1	1.2
Total	84	100.0

Table H41

Stay-ins' School Dislikes

	Total	%
What Do You Dislike About School?		
Teachers in general	29	24.0
Classes and subjects in general	19	15.7
School is boring	12	9.9
Conforming to school rules	10	8.3
Not learning anything useful	8	6.6
Routine - doing same thing daily	7	5.7
Teachers bug me, pick on me, too strict	6	5.0
Teachers don't seem to care about students or teaching	5	4.1
Homework	5	4.1
The system in general	5	4.1
Teachers give attention to the smart students & ignore the rest	3	2.5
Teachers don't stick to the subject	3	2.5
Peer pressure to conform	3	2.5
Obligation to attend regulary	2	1.6
Feel uncomfortable being treated like a child	2	1.6
Exams	1	.8
School is overcroweded, no room for activities	1	.8
Total	121	99.8

Table H42

Stay-ins' Thinking Regarding Leaving School

	Total	%
Have You Ever Considered Leaving School Early?		
Yes	42	68.8
No	19	31.2
When Was Last Time?		
Recently (within the last week)	23	54.8
Last semester	6	14.3
Did drop out	5	11.9
This month	4	9.5
A year ago	2	4.8
Current semester	1	2.4
Several times	1	2.4
Total	42	100.1

Table H43

Stay-ins' Consultations Regarding Staying Versus Leaving

	Total	%
Did You Talk To Anyone Regarding Staying Or Leaving?		
Yes	35	57.4
No	26	42.6
Friends	9	
Both parents	7	
Counsellor	7	
Mom	3	
Dad	3	
Fiance, boy/girlfriend	2	
Relatives	2	
Principal	2	
Vice principal	2	
Teacher(s)1	2	
Social worker	1	
Total	40	
Did Anything Change At The Time?		
Yes	28	45.9
No	33	54.1
Decided on own to stay	11	
Parents helped me decide	9	
Principal/teacher/counsellor helped	3	
Friends helped	3	
Problems dissipated	2	
Total	28	

Table H44

Stay-ins' Acquaintance of Early School Leavers

	Total	%
Do You Know Anyone Who Left School Early?		
Yes	56	91.8
No	5	8.2
Why Do You Think They Left School Early?		
School Problems		
Conflict with teacher/principal	9	
Had difficulty with subjects	7	
Just fed up with school	7	
Bored, not interested in school	5	
They were failing	4	
Hated routine, the system	4	
Poor attendance	3	
Kicked out	2	
Wanted more freedom/independence	2	
Hated doing homework	2	
	45	45.0
Work		
Wanted to work instead,to earn money	11	
School work suffered because of the jobs they had while attending school	3	
They needed to work to support themselves	1	
	15	15.0

Table H44 continued...

	Total	%
Self		
They had a negative attitude toward school	20	
Personal problems	5	
Peers influenced them to quit	5	
Home problems	3	
Marriage	2	
Alcohol and drugs diverted their attention away from chosen goals	2	
In trouble with the law	1	
Didn't get along with anyone	1	
Pregnant	1	
Total	100	

Table H45

Stay-ins' Responses to Early Leavers Departures

	Total	%
What Was Your Response To Their Decision To Leave?		
Encouraged them to stay	17	30.3
Encouraged them to leave	13	23.2
Neutral - had no involvement	16	28.6
O.K. to leave if you have a job or something to go to	4	7.1
We discussed the pros and cons and left it to them	3	5.4
Leaving school early is stupid	2	3.6
Knew it was going to happen so wasn't surprised, accepted it	1	1.8
Total	56	100.0
How Do You Now Feel About Their Leaving?		
Still disagree with decision	22	39.3
Neutral, I don't really care one way or another	14	25.0
Still agree with decision	13	23.2
Changed my mind - now I agree	4	7.1
Now I disagree	3	5.4
Total	56	100.0

Table H46

Stay-ins' Reported Thoughts Regarding Early Leavers Returning to School

	Total	%
Would You Like To See Those Early Leavers Return To School?		
Yes	33	54.1
No	12	19.7
Neutral or Undecided	16	26.2
Total	61	100.0
Do You Think They Will?		
No	35	57.4
Not Likely	10	16.4
Yes	9	14.7
Don't Know	7	11.5
Total	61	100.0

Table H47

Stay-ins' Perceptions of Teacher Attitude Towards Early School Leavers

	Total	%
What Do You Think Is The General Attitude Of Teachers Toward Early School Leavers?		
Encouraged to drop out	22	36.1
Concerned - encouraged to stay	21	34.4
Neutral - don't care, not concerned	18	29.5
Total	61	100.0

Table H48

Stay-ins' Perceptions of Student Attitudes

Towards Early School Leavers

	Total	%
What Do You Think Is The General Attitude Of Students Toward Early School Leavers?		
Tend to look down on leavers and regard them as failures	21	
Students neutral, don't care	13	
Regard leaving as waste of potential & opportunity	9	
Regarded as individual matter	6	
A good choice for some people	5	
It's fine to leave if you have a job to go to	4	
In some cases it improves the learning atmosphere in school	3	
Envious -- they would like to leave as well	3	
Students are glad to see some people leave	1	
Total	65	
Is The Early School Leaving Situation A Concern To You?		
Yes	22	36.1
No	39	63.9
If "yes" - why?		
People are cheating themselves of an education by leaving	8	
I think it's wrong to leave but they can if they want	8	
Leaving affects school moral & makes others think of leaving	6	
People should finish Grade 12	4	
Education is necessary for better employment opportunities	3	
Total	29	